

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XVII.*

*May, 1911.*

*No. 5.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit.*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

Vol. XVII.

May, 1911.

---

No. 5.

## ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS, THEORY OF STATE, THEORY OF ART.

---

In the last two articles we have been considering that portion of philosophy which Aristotle calls theoretical, because, he says, it is a matter of speculative knowledge, and has no immediate relation to action. Physics belongs to theoretical philosophy, and so do psychology and metaphysics. Philosophy ceases to be theoretical when it begins to have relation to action. Now, human action, according to Aristotle, is twofold; there is that kind of action which has relation to ethical, or moral, ends, which we call conduct; and there is that kind of action which has relation to the production of artistic effects, and which we call artistic creative action. The three divisions therefore, or the three parts, of philosophy, as Aristotle calls them, are *theoretical*, which has no immediate relation to action, *practical*, which takes up the study of human conduct, including ethics and politics, and *creative* or *poetical*, philosophy, which takes up the study of the creative faculty, including poetry, rhetoric and art in general. It is clear, therefore, that when we bring together as the subject of this paper, Ethics and Politics and Art, we are treating conjointly two parts of philosophy, namely the practical and poetical.

Practical philosophy, then, takes up the study of human conduct both individual and aggregate, in relation to happiness. That happiness is the aim, conscious or unconscious, of all our



actions seemed self-evident to Aristotle as it did to all the Greeks who thought about the subject at all. In their view, happiness and excellence are the same, since the word happiness means merely wellbeing of soul or spirit. That a man *could* consciously aim at unhappiness seemed to them impossible, and that he *should* make misery his deliberate purpose never occurred to them, as it does so frequently to modern thinkers, of the pessimistic school. The Greeks were young; they belong to the youth of the race; and the youthful are always optimistic by temperament. It is only in the old age of the race, as in the old age of the individual, that happiness sometimes seems to have gone out of reach, and the notion occurs that perhaps we are not obliged to be happy, but rather, to be miserable. At any rate, Aristotle belongs to the optimists. He starts with the assumption that happiness is the aim of human action. But, how is happiness to be attained? Socrates had made some progress in the discussion of this problem. He called attention to two kinds of happiness. There is, he said, one kind of happiness which arises from fortune, or chance, the happiness that is given us by inheritance, by environment, by opportunity, by a happy combination of circumstances. This is happiness which we do not earn, and, as it comes to us without any effort of ours, it may be lost to us without any fault of ours; it may desert us as capriciously as it formerly sought us unaccountably. It is, of its nature, ephemeral, uncertain, and we never have, so to speak, a flawless title to it. On the other hand, there is happiness which we do not inherit but acquire; which comes, not as a gift of the gods but as a reward of our own efforts; the bread which we earn in the sweat of our brow, the wages which we wrest from a master that is hard to please, fruit that we glean from a hard, unproductive soil; in a word, happiness that is our own in the strict sense of the word, because we owe it to no one but ourselves. To this happiness, if we once acquire it, we have a clear title, and an unshakable one. Once it is ours, it is ours forever: no reverse of fortune can deprive us of it, no accident or untoward event can diminish it or detract

from it. If now, we wish, as all men do, to attain happiness, and to remain in that state, the obvious moral, says Socrates, is to rely as little as possible on the happiness which is evanescent by nature, and build our hope exclusively on that kind of happiness which cannot fail us. Socrates went farther. He taught that virtue is the one indispensable means of attaining true happiness, and counseled moderation in all things as a condition of a virtuous life. Plato, though the aim of all his philosophy was ethical, did comparatively little towards clarifying our ideas of virtue and happiness. He defined virtue as a kind of harmony, or health, of the soul, and distinguished the four kinds of virtue which have since been called the cardinal virtues, wisdom, fortitude, temperance and justice. His influence, as was said in a previous article, was inspirational rather than illuminative; he incited to virtue by showing how lovely virtue is and how sordid are the things that prevent its attainment. He did not analyse it as a psychologist, nor did he bring to bear on his description of it much knowledge of nature or of human nature. That was left for Aristotle to do.

Aristotle's analysis of happiness is scientific. By this is meant that he bases his examination of the question on principles which he applies elsewhere to the study of natural phenomena. He assumes that the excellence of man is happiness. In his philosophy of nature he discovers that the excellence of anything consists in the realization of the purpose for which it exists. The purpose for which the flower exists is to grow, blossom, and reproduce itself in a certain definite way. If it does this, it is a good flower. The animal, also, has its functions to perform; if it performs them well, it is a good animal. Again, in the products of art, the same holds true. A watch is an instrument for telling the time: if it serves its purpose well, it is a good watch. True, when we come to man we are using the term good in the moral sense; this however, does not make any difference. A good man is a man who attains the purpose for which he exists. And, as in the case of the flower, the animal and the watch, the purpose is the realization



of some form of activity. Now, the form of activity peculiar to man is the exercise of reason. Therefore, in the perfect performance of the reasoning faculty man's excellence, and consequently, his happiness, will consist. If this seems at first sight a rather far-fetched idea of virtue and happiness, we have only to look at its application in order to realize that, after all, it is eminently practical, and as sane a guide of conduct as any that philosophy unaided has offered. What strength and rugged grandeur is to the oak tree, what fragrance and delicacy of tint is to the rose, what grace and swiftness is to the antelope, what keenness of scent and fidelity to instinct is to the hunting dog,—the crowning excellence of nature in each case—reason is to man. According to the standard of human nature, that person is most perfect, has attained the highest excellence, and is, therefore, most happy, who has acquired the greatest perfection of reason. Aristotle, however, knew human nature too well to be content with this academic view, if I may so call it, of virtue. He was not the man to overlook the tremendous importance of the irrational forces in human character and in human life. He was quick to see that, while reason is our chief distinction, it is not our only characteristic, nor is it the mainspring of all our actions. We have feelings, passions, emotions, in a word, "affections," as he calls them, and these are a very important part of our nature. There never yet was a human being so bloodless as to be incapable of anger or zeal or indignation. There never was a man in whom there was not some remnant of an irrational impulse to fight; and as to woman, Aristotle was not so blind as to overlook her claim to be occasionally unreasonable, though he was not modern enough or tactful enough to call it "sweet unreason." In short, a human being whom the definition "Being endowed with reason" would adequately describe, would be a monstrosity. A man or a woman whose mental life would be one interminable series of acts of reason never existed and fortunately never will exist. The power of reason, therefore, must be considered in relation to the rest of man's mental life, especially in relation to the affec-

tions and to all kinds of irrational tendencies. The soul is no Crusoe's uninhabited island in which reason is unquestioned "monarch of all it surveys." If such a condition existed, it might, like the shipwrecked mariner's condition, be properly referred to as a "horrible state." Reason is, or should be, monarch. But its way is not undisputed. its subjects are the passions and the other irrational impulses which murmur at the authority of reason, and at times revolt against that authority. Moral virtue consists in the perfection by which reason maintains its control, and keeps the irrational impulses within bounds, neither allowing them undue liberty, like some lax or inefficient ruler, nor, like a tyrant, reducing them to complete and ruthless subjection. Moral virtue consists in the maintenance of the golden mean between two extremes, each of which is irrational. Thus, courage is a moral virtue in which reason maintains the golden mean between cowardice and reckless daring. He who refuses to face danger when he ought to face it is a coward: he lacks the full measure of courage when he yields to an unreasoning impulse of fear. He who rushes into danger when there is no occasion to do so is foolhardy, and fails by excess, as the coward fails by defect: he yields to contempt of danger which is as unreasonable as the coward's exaggerated fear of danger. Courage, therefore, is a condition in which reason dominates both these irrational impulses and maintains the golden mean between them. Again, take the virtue of generosity. He who fails to give when he should give is stingy, and sins by defect. He who gives without stint and indiscriminately, is lavish, and sins by excess. The truly generous person gives, or refrains from giving, according to the norm or standard set, in each case, by the verdict of reason. I do not say that these definitions are above criticism; on the contrary, I think that Christian ideals of conduct have modified some of these for the better. I am simply expounding Aristotle's notion of virtue, for which I merely claim that it is sane, human and scientific. Before leaving this question of moral virtue I must call your attention to one other point. Aristotle included in his system of morals



many "virtues" which we no longer consider to belong to morals at all, but look upon rather as matters of good breeding or good manners. For instance, among the virtues he reckons affability. This, he says, is the golden mean between boorishness and obsequiousness. We catch his meaning readily. The boorish person is lacking in the graces and charms of social intercourse; the obsequious person is guilty of excess in those matters. But how can we determine where either excess or defect ends and where true affability begins? Aristotle says, by reason. We are inclined to think that it is a matter of innate tact, or the unwritten code of one's environment, or home influence, or example, or education. Besides, we do not consider affability to be a moral virtue at all. Although here, I think, we err. For affability, if it be not a virtue, may be made so to speak, the matter of a virtue, when it is inspired by a distinctly moral principle, such as Christian charity. A man may be naturally affable, he may acquire affability by the influence of home or school, or he may have it thrust upon him by the requirements of his position in life and the office which he holds. It rests with himself to transform it into a moral virtue by giving it a moral motive.

Virtue, then, is the perfection of reason. So far, we have studied the moral virtues, which consist in that perfection by which reason, holding the lower impulses in control, outlines in each case, and impels to a course of action that avoids irrational excess and irrational defect. Considered in itself, however, reason is capable of perfection without relation to the irrational part of our nature. Perfections of this kind are called by Aristotle intellectual, as distinct from the others which are moral. The first and most obvious intellectual perfection of reason is scientific knowledge; "Happy he who knows the causes of things," sang the Latin poet. Knowledge is not only power, but perfection of soul, and is, therefore, according to Aristotle's definition, a means of happiness. Aristotle is too optimistic, too youthful, too Greek, in fact, to see the other side of the problem, or to fall in with the mood of him who declares that "he who increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."



He has not learned, as we have, to distinguish knowledge which is useful, knowledge which is useless, and knowledge which is harmful to the soul. All knowledge, he believes, is good, and therefore, he puts scientific knowledge among the intellectual virtues. Next to scientific knowledge, or on the same plane with it, he places Art, the knowledge of truth in the production of works of art, and Prudence, the knowledge of what one ought to do in the conduct of life, or, as we should say, a knowledge of human nature. Above these he places Intelligence, or the knowledge of first principles, which we should call the faculty of judging axiomatic truths, and highest of all he places Wisdom, which is philosophy, and knowledge of the highest, or ultimate, truths. If reason is the crowning glory of man, wisdom is the crowning glory of reason. It is preëminently the virtue of mature minds: Aristotle would echo the thought of Tennyson, "Knowledge comes but wisdom lingers." It belongs, he holds, to youth to be inquisitive, and so attain scientific knowledge; it belongs to the later years of life to attain the wisdom by which one meditates on general principles and grasps the abstract truth of things, as it belongs to old age to attain the prudence by which one judges in matters of conduct.

Comparing the intellectual with the moral virtues, Aristotle enunciates a doctrine which, until we consider it carefully, seems to us to be a very dangerous doctrine indeed. He places the intellectual virtues above the moral. And so, he seems to say, it is better to have a knowledge of chemistry or biology than it is to be truthful; it is better to be a philosopher than to be honest; it is better to have a knowledge of art or of human nature than to keep the commandments of God and obey the law of the land. It is true, Aristotle places the intellectual virtues above the moral: at the same time, he is guilty of no such moral anarchy as this. On the contrary, he looks upon the moral virtues as a prerequisite to the attainment of the intellectual virtues. Unless a man be truthful and honest and clean of life, he cannot, says Aristotle, attain those perfections of mind in which intellectual virtue consists.

In one sense he is right, and the innocence, if I may so call it, of his view of the matter is not so very childlike. But in a sense too, he is wrong. The world now knows that it is possible for a man to attain the very highest perfection of mind in the theoretical order without possessing even the most elementary virtue in the moral order. And yet, Aristotle's "innocence" is justified in the ideal order, at least. For moral depravity is a blot on perfection of intellect, and it is still true that the reward of a clean heart is a fuller vision of God.

Before leaving the subject of Ethics, let me call your attention to two minor points, which are deserving of mention here on account of the treatment they receive in the Aristotelian work, *Nicomachean Ethics*. I mean Aristotle's description of the Magnanimous Man and his dissertation on Friendship. Both from the literary and from the ethical point of view, the passages in which these occur are among the finest in all Aristotelian literature. The portrait of the magnanimous man is a masterpiece. It is said to have been suggested, in part at least, by Aristotle's distinguished pupil, Alexander. I like better to think that it is suggested, perhaps unconsciously, by Aristotle's own moral character. Severely simple, yet, at the same time, not without a certain grand generosity in the use of superlatives, indeed, resembling in its style the great-minded man, the passage<sup>1</sup> is, I believe, a true description of the soul of the great philosopher himself. The first trait of the great-minded man is a proper, or, as we say, a just, appreciation of his own worth and dignity: he cannot be great who has a mean opinion of himself. The great-minded man places honor above every other external good: yet even in that he will preserve the golden mean. As regards his personal accomplishments, he must, above all things, have virtue, and of every virtue he shall have the heroic degree. From this height of virtue he will look down upon every dignity and distinction, and, in a certain way, on virtue itself, so that he will consider himself superior to all of them, and will pursue nothing, not even virtue, immoderately. Poverty has

<sup>1</sup> *Eth. Nic.*, iv, Cap. 3, n. 2 ff.



no terror for him, and riches no danger: for, if he is wealthy, his opportunities for showing his true greatness are thereby increased, and he is equal to his opportunities. He disdains what is petty, even in the matter of personal danger: great risks for a great cause entice him onward: the trivial dangers which occupy so much of the attention of the small-minded, do not even engage his attention. The only shame he knows is that of being the beneficiary of the goodness of others: therefore, he always gives more than he receives. He affects a certain elegant indolence, not as a mere mannerism, but as a part of his character; for he "does very little" says Aristotle, meaning that he does not engage in an enterprise unless it is in the heroic scale and worthy of renown. He leaves the trivial things of life to the trivial minded. He is candid, though not to the point of brusqueness; for he fears not to tell the truth and always does so, except, says Aristotle, when he adopts the common practice of speaking ironically. Finally, the great-minded man reveals his superiority even in his speech and gesture: too serious to occupy himself with what is not worthy of him, he avoids the gossip of the hour; his words are few; his utterance is deliberate, and even his gestures show that he is above all nervous haste. "Such," he concludes, "is the magnanimous man."

The disquisition on friendship is conducted with the same loftiness of thought and rigorous simplicity of style. Aristotle does not believe in the sentiment contained in the saying which he quotes "When the gods favor you, what need of friends?" No happiness, he says, is complete without friends to share it and to enable us to enjoy it. Those who have all that the heart desires do not really possess it, for they do not enjoy it, unless they have friends. The afflicted need friends, for comfort and support; the young, for advice; the aged for assistance, and the mature man for united action. Friendship is not an institution; it is a law of nature. But there are various kinds of friendship, some based on profit, some on the pleasure people find in one another's company: the best friendship is that which is based neither on profit nor pleasure, but

on virtue and esteem. In friendship of that kind there must be equality. Perfect friends *are* equal; when one is superior to the other in station, in talent, in wealth, there may still be a friendship of the secondary sort (not perfect), if they meet on an equal plane and treat each other as equals. The details of quarreling among friends, the causes of quarrels and the remedies for them are full of interest, and show, among other things, how little human nature has changed since Aristotle's day. We must pass them over however, and call attention once more to Aristotle's repeated saying that man is intended by nature for the society of his fellow-men. If he is to live at all, he must have friends of some kind. Thus the discussion of friendship brings us to the next division of Aristotle's philosophy, his theory of the State.

There is really no transition from Ethics to Politics in Aristotle's philosophy. Both are integral parts of his system of practical philosophy. The aim of that philosophy is to show us how happiness is to be attained: Ethics treats of individual, Politics of social, well-being. That is the only difference between them. Ethical well-being culminates in the enjoyment of friendship; friendship expands, so to speak, into political organization. For, as friendship is a law of nature; so some sort of social organization is natural to man. As Aristotle somewhat quaintly expresses it, "Man is a political animal." His meaning is that, as some animals lead solitary lives, while others live in herds, or flocks, or droves or swarms, are, in a word, gregarious, man belongs to the latter class. It is possible, indeed, though difficult, for the individual human being to obtain the necessities of physical existence without the aid of his fellowmen—a man may procure his own food, make his own clothes and defend himself single-handed against wild beasts—but for his mental, and, above all, for his moral well-being, he requires the society of his fellowmen and education, which is possible only in an organized condition of society. Aristotle is, therefore, opposed to the notion afterwards put forward by the Epicureans and defended in modern times by Jean Jacques Rousseau, that the natural state of man is



unsocial, and that society is a voluntary institution founded on a so-called social contract. Observe that Aristotle does not exclude the utilitarian motive: he does not deny that man may have been, and is, dependent on his fellowmen for his material well-being, and have had that motive as a secondary incentive to form a social organization. But he insists, and rightly, it seems to me, that the primary impulse to organize was not the deliberate consideration of expediency, but an inclination that is deep-seated and intrinsic in human nature. It is the desire of happiness and not the need of food, clothing and defence, that is at the basis of social organization. Therefore, continues Aristotle, that aim of the state is ethical and not merely economical. When the State has brought about conditions favorable to the material well-being of its subjects, when every citizen is protected in his property rights, well clothed and well fed, the mission of the State is by no means fulfilled. There is still the establishment of virtue, the promotion of happiness, the attainment of mental and moral well-being to be considered. We must remember that this was before the advent of Christianity, when religion, among the Greeks especially, had little to do with morality and happiness in this life, and left the social order practically unaffected. Aristotle, in fact, throws on the State the burden which later political philosophers shift to the shoulders of religion. Some shift it completely, and reduce the mission of the State to a purely economic responsibility, others, more properly, divide the burden, and maintain that it is the duty both of Church and State to secure, each in its own sphere, the supremacy of morality and, therefore, of human happiness.

Such being the mission of the State, according to Aristotle, namely the establishment and maintenance of happiness by means of knowledge and virtue, it is not difficult to outline the constitution of the perfect State. Here, however, Aristotle places himself at once in a category apart from those who, before his time and since, have drawn up a scheme of ideal government. They proceeded on abstract principles, convinced that what ought to work out for the best would work out

for the best—a dangerous assumption when one in dealing with human nature in the aggregate. Plato, for instance, argued that, because there are three parts of the human soul, the rational, the irascible and the appetitive, (or reason, courage, and desire) so there ought to be three orders in the perfect State, the Rulers, whose characteristic virtue is wisdom, the Soldiers, whose peculiar perfection is courage, and the Producers, who should cultivate in a special way the virtue of industry. Aristotle avoids all such theoretical procedure. He goes at once to the facts, as far as they are ascertainable. He studies the constitutions of the Greek states as he finds them, and tries to sift out of the mass of evidence before him the institutions and laws which have proved practically useful. His method here, as in his *Ethics*, is eminently scientific. We may find fault with his conclusions, we may even judge that he was in many respects hampered by his prejudices and by the limitations of his knowledge, but we cannot fail to admire the spirit of scientific research in which he conducted his investigation.

The conclusion which he reaches is contained in his description of the perfect commonwealth. Here, once more, saneness of judgment is his most striking characteristic. In social well-being, as in individual virtue, there must be a golden mean. If he were carried away, as a less cautious theorist might have been, by his grand principle that the chief aim of the State is ethical, he might have decided that the perfect commonwealth is that which maintains a standard of political rights identical with that of moral right. The constitution of such a State would resemble the Blue Laws of some of the New England colonies. Aristotle is too well-balanced to entertain so one-sided a view. In the perfect State there must, he says, be room for freedom and wealth and healthy pleasures as well as for virtue. This combination, he finds, is best secured in a form of government which is a mixture of oligarchy and democracy. He reaches this conclusion after he has discussed three possible forms of government, monarchy, or the rule of one, oligarchy, or the rule of a few, and democracy, or the



rule of the many. He discusses each of these in turn, and finds that each has its advantages, as well as its disadvantages. Theoretically speaking, a monarchy would be best. If the ruler were ideally perfect, placing justice and right before every other consideration, and if the subjects were equally perfect, preferring virtue to everything, even to wealth and liberty, then, there would be an evident advantage, he thinks, in the centralization of authority in the person of one sovereign. He quotes Homer to the effect

“The rule of many is not good : let one man be king.”

But, he sees at once that there are many practical difficulties. The ruler is not always perfect: he may prefer self-interest, his own glory, the advantages of his house, to the good of his subjects. He will almost inevitably desire to make his rule hereditary in his family, and what guarantee have we that it will not pass into the hands of an unworthy heir, to the ruin of the whole people? When the people stand so low as to be incapable of taking any share in the government, or when the individual stands so high that the people naturally revere him and obey him as their ruler, then, and then alone, is the rule of one man the best for the welfare of the commonwealth. Next, he considers the oligarchy, or aristocracy, which is the rule of the few, or of the best. This he considers to be superior to the monarchy, because it excludes the hereditary principle and divides the responsibility of government. That one man may be demoralized by unlimited power and become tyrannical, is, he thinks, quite probable; but that several rulers should all at once lose their sense of responsibility is far from likely, and so long as there are some who remain faithful to their ideals, these will act as a check on the others. The danger of an oligarchy is this: the more progress a nation makes, the larger is the number of those who are capable of sharing in the government, and who become discontented if they are excluded from it. A thorough democracy, on the other hand, while it makes provision for this demand, has not the unity and cohesiveness which are necessary for the successful

performance of the business of government. Therefore, he concludes, that government is best which combines with the aristocratic form a certain measure of democracy, so that all the people shall share to some extent the authority in the state. Throughout the whole discussion there runs one great principle, eminently sane and practical, namely: That form of government is best which best suits the character and attainments of the people to be governed. We can hardly improve on that principle. With all our experience gleaned from subsequent history, with our knowledge of revolutions and their causes, with our wider knowledge of human nature both in the individual and in the aggregate, we can but repeat what Aristotle taught, and no matter how devoted we ourselves are to the ideal of popular freedom, we must acknowledge that other forms of government are the best, elsewhere, because they best suit the character of the people. Assuming for once the rôle of the prophet, Aristotle, looking forward to the progress of education and the spread of enlightenment, foretells that the trend of political change will be in the direction of greater popular freedom. Not at once, nor universally, was this outlook to be justified. In the Athens where he taught and where, perhaps, he wrote his work *On Politics*, there was to come first the tyranny of the Macedonian, then that of the Roman, then a succession of tyrannies of various kinds, and it was not until our own day that Greece was able to realize in a constitutional monarchy the form of government in which the people were to have more than a nominal share. While Aristotle was teaching these doctrines in the shaded walks near the gymnasium of Apollo, Demosthenes was in the popular assembly striving by his sublime eloquence to awaken in his fellow-citizens the dormant sentiment of patriotism. But the time had not come. And, aside from the purpose of Divine Providence, which Aristotle did not reckon with, and which even we can only believe in, without trying to understand, the reason of this tardy realization of a relatively perfect form of government was the reason he assigns: the people of Greece were not capable of governing themselves. Aside from



exceptional instances, where, God for inscrutable reasons, permitting, the strong hand of the tyrant holds in check a people fully capable of freedom, the progress of democracy in the true sense of the word has been step by step, coincident with the progress of education and moral enlightenment.

Judging by these general principles, which are sane, enlightened, practical, and surprisingly modern, we should rank Aristotle very high among the great political philosophers. He was not, however, independent of the defects and limitations of his time and of the civilization in which he lived, which, after all, was pagan. This appears especially in the details of his scheme for the perfect State. The utilitarian view of marriage, the doctrine that defective and deformed children should be exposed to perish, the view that some human beings are naturally ordained to slavery, the conviction that neither the barbarians of the North nor the inhabitants of the Orient are capable of freedom, which is a prerogative, apparently, of the Greeks, the principle that man is made for the State and not the State for man—all these show how far Aristotle fell short of the Christian sentiment and conviction in regard to the value of the individual human soul and the inviolability of the rights which man, however defective, possesses as a child of God. The study of this part of his political philosophy emphasizes the profound truth of the remark so often made even by the enemies of Christianity that it was Christ and His teaching that introduced true freedom into the world.

An interesting and important portion of the work *On Politics* is devoted to the attitude which the State should maintain towards Art in general, and towards Rhetoric and Poetry in particular. This brings us to the third division of Aristotle's philosophy, and the last of the topics set down for discussion in this paper. Poetical, or creative, philosophy includes the theory of Art and the discussion of the Beautiful. It is, therefore, practically identical with what we call nowadays Esthetics. To the philosophy of knowledge and reality, and the philosophy of human conduct in the individual and in society, Aristotle adds the philosophy of artistic production.

Here, as in the other two branches, he is so independent and so thoroughly revolutionary that to his many titles as founder of logic, founder of natural science, and so forth, may be added the title Founder of Artistic and Literary Criticism. It is true, there is wanting here that comprehensiveness of treatment which we find in the other departments of philosophy. To the vast subject of literary and artistic criticism Aristotle has contributed only two treatises, the *Rhetoric* and the work *On Poetry*, and even the latter has come down to us in an unfinished state. Yet, what this part of his teaching lacks in comprehensiveness it has made up in the extent of its influence. For, long after the Stagyrte had ceased to be the "Master of those who know," long after he had ceased to be an authority in natural science, metaphysics, psychology, ethics and logic, he continued and still, to an extent continues, to influence the theory of Art and the art of poetic composition. The credit of this influence he should, perhaps, share with another. If Aristotle had not had as materials for his study of poetry the most perfect model of poetic composition, in the Homeric poems, he could not, perhaps, have formulated as he did the theory of that art. Homer, even without Aristotle to reveal the principles of his poetic art, would have continued to charm and inspire the generations that came after him, but, without Aristotle to interpret him, he would have charmed and inspired without enlightening the reflective mind, and without furnishing canons of poetic taste on which the science of criticism is founded. Here, as elsewhere, Aristotle was first in the field, and no small credit is due to him for having thought of reducing artistic production to certain fixed principles.

He begins his discussion of the principles of poetry by remarking that art in general is imitative. Our enjoyment of artistic production arises from the fact that there is in us an instinct of imitation, the exercise of which brings pleasure in every stage of our existence. As children, we indulge one form of this instinct in games and other childlike amusements; as mature men and women, we find an outlet for the same

instinct in artistic production and the contemplation of artistic products. This sentiment has been criticised as unworthy of the high mission of art, as reducing artistic activity to mere pastime. That is to misrepresent what Aristotle means. He wishes to connect the artistic impulse with something fundamental in our nature, without intending to bring art down to the level of the instinct by which a little girl plays at being school-teacher or a boy starts to play Indian after he has seen a performance of the Wild West Show. In the enjoyment which we experience in artistic imitation, he recognizes an instance of the universal desire of knowledge, which is not satisfied, even in art, until art somehow shows forth the inner intelligible essences of things. The imitation, therefore, which is at the root of all artistic production, is not mere copying of what is in nature around us, or in human nature: it is an effort to attain and express the ideal. It has nature for its standard: it "holds the mirror up to nature": but, it has for its ultimate standard what is innermost in nature, and what the unartistic mind fails to see in nature. Goethe says very truly that it needs some insight into Aristotle's general philosophy to understand what he says about the drama. The misunderstanding in regard to his doctrine that art is imitation is due, I think, to a lack of knowledge of his metaphysics. Aristotle's true meaning, as explained by Professor Butcher<sup>2</sup> is that Art, "resembling nature in a certain instinctive, yet rational, faculty, does not follow the halting course of nature's progress. The artist ignores the intervening steps, the slow processes, by which nature attempts to bridge the space between the potential and the actual. The form which nature has been striving, and perhaps vainly striving, to attain stands forth embodied in a creation of the mind. The ideal has taken concrete shape, the finished product stands before us, nor do we ask how it has come to be what it is. The flaws and failures incident to the natural process are removed, and in a glorified appearance, we discern nature's ideal intention. Fine art, then, is a completion of nature . . . it presents

<sup>2</sup> *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, London, 1902, p. 157.



to us only an image, but a purified image of nature's original." But while this recognition of the ideal in the product of art is the chief source of pleasure in artistic enjoyment, Aristotle is too keen a psychologist to hold that intellect alone is concerned, and that the only element in artistic enjoyment is intellectual. He expressly teaches that the feelings also, or affections, are concerned, and the effect of art on them is, he says, a kind of purification. This is the doctrine of a very celebrated passage in which Aristotle declares that the aim of tragedy is to purify the emotions of pity and fear. The meaning seems to be that, when we observe on the stage some great action which moves to pity or to fear, the mind is thereby rendered purer by being rid of these emotions, which are in themselves painful and do not minister to, but rather hinder, the performance of heroic deeds. The idea of purification is partly physiological and partly religious, being suggested probably both by the practice of medicine and by the custom prevalent in all the mysteries of ridding the soul of sin by some process of ablution or the performance of some penance. The passage, especially what is known as "the pity and fear clause," has given rise to much discussion. I give here the interpretation which seems to me to be most reasonable. It is of perhaps greater importance to note that, while in Greece generally, both before and after Aristotle's time, the aim of art was supposed to be moral instruction, Aristotle assigns to it no other purpose than merely to please. He judges poetry by esthetic and logical standards, taking no direct account of ethical aims and tendencies. Still, he will not allow that poetry should be altogether independent of morality. For, while its aim is pleasure, the pleasure must be sane and wholesome: the theme, especially of tragedy, which he places above all other kinds of poetry, must be noble, and tragedy does not admit the presentation of moral depravity except where truth demands that such a presentation be introduced. Thus, to take a modern instance, Aristotle would have condemned the theme of *Paradise Lost*, because the chief character is Satan, although he

would have allowed the occasional introduction of Satan in episodes of the poem.

Aristotle's doctrine of the three unities in tragedy or epic is almost a commonplace in literary criticism. He held, or is supposed to have held, that the plot should conform to unity of action, unity of time and unity of place. With regard to the unity of action, the requirement, in the large sense, has been admitted by all literary critics. James Russell Lowell, in his *Old English Dramatists* (p. 55) writes: "In a play we not only expect a succession of scenes but that each scene should lead by a logic more or less stringent, if not to the next, at least to something that is to follow, and that all should contribute their fraction of impulse towards the inevitable catastrophe. That is to say, the structure should be organic, with a necessary and harmonious connection and relation of parts, and not merely mechanical, with an arbitrary or haphazard joining of one part with another." This is all that Aristotle requires, a certain organic or logical unity among the incidents of the epic or the scenes of the tragedy. The notion that he insisted also on unity of place and unity of time is founded on a curiously persistent misapprehension. Such misunderstandings die slowly, and, even nowadays, one hears the critic talk glibly of Aristotle's "three unities." The so-called "unity of time," demanding that the action of the piece should take place within a single day, between sunrise and sunset, is merely a clumsy mistranslation. What Aristotle means is that the *performance of the play* should take not more than that period of time. Perhaps some of us who are not enthusiastic Wagnerians, but have been compelled to sit through a five-hour opera, may sympathize with the Aristotelian rule. But, with the Greeks the play was very frequently an all day affair, and no doubt, Aristotle was legislating against authors for whom even the period between sunrise and sunset was not long enough. As to unity of place, Aristotle does not speak of it at all. It is merely a figment in the minds of his critics.

If we turn now from these general principles which are at the basis of all artistic production in general and of poetry

in particular, we shall find that the various arts are differentiated from one another according to the means which they employ in the process of imitation: painting employs color; sculpture, form; music, the voice; poetry, words, and dance, rythm. We cannot, however, dwell on these details, interesting as they are. The subject will be found treated at length, as it deserves to be, in Saintsbury's *History of Literary Criticism*, especially Chapter III of Volume I, which is devoted to Aristotle, in Butcher's translation of the *Poetics* and in the more recent translation by Bywater.

WILLIAM TURNER.



## SPANISH-AMERICAN LITERATURE.

---

The language known as Spanish, is really Castilian, the triumphant dialect of the Iberian Peninsula which, with the Catalan and the Galicio-Lusitanian, belongs to the Romance family, the offspring of the Latin. It was this language with its Andalusian modifications that the Spaniards brought with them to the New World. Excepting Brazil, and the three Guianas, it is now spoken from the Rio Grande to the extreme southern limits of the continent. It possesses a double literature, of the mother country, and of the American Republics, once colonies of Spain. The literature of Spanish America is a subordinate branch of the Castilian, with characteristics of its own, borrowed from the scenery, the aboriginal population, and the languages of America.

Castilian literature begins in the thirteenth century, its earliest production being verse of a rude character, the *Poema del Cid*. From its obscure and anonymous cradle, it advances step by step through chronicles, ballads, and poems, until it reaches its golden age, the age of the drama, and of the great masterpiece, *Don Quijote*. At this time the influence of the Renaissance was strongly felt, and the Italian style, the *Culto*, predominated, owing its beginning to Boscan, and Garcilaso de La Vega. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the great literary triumvirate of Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Calderon flourished, witnessed the rise of Spanish literature to its highest perfection. This period coincides with the colonization of the New World.

It was quite natural that the literature of the Western hemisphere should be influenced by that of the mother-country but it, also, reacted upon it, furnishing to its history such names as Ercilla y Zuñiga, Ruiz de Alarcón, and Castellanos.

The earliest literature of America was historical and religious, though it was not until 1535 that works were

printed. In fact many writings were not published, until our own day, while not a few manuscripts still remain unprinted, and hidden away in the libraries of Spain and of America. From time to time, one or the other of special interest is drawn from its obscurity by individuals or learned bodies, to speak the language of the past, after centuries of silence.

Leaving such writings as those of Columbus and his son Fernando, besides brief memoirs, out of the question, it may be said that Bartolomé de las Casas is the first historian of America, though his great work, the "*Historia de las Indias*," was not completed until after the first volume of Oviedo's had been printed.

Mexico furnished, in the sixteenth century, the most abundant themes to historians like Motilinia, Sahagun and later Juan de Torquemada, all three members of the Franciscan order. At that early period, the Franciscans and Dominicans were the great writers of America, while the Augustinians distinguished themselves in Mexico by their scientific additions to general knowledge. In point of history, Peru followed Mexico, with writers like Xerez, Cieza de Leon, Zarate, Garcilaso the Inca and many more, to be succeeded by the Jesuit Acosta whose large work on the Indies is monumental. The Jesuits arrived in America in the second half of the sixteenth century; but it was not long before they had become the great educators of Spanish America, establishing colleges everywhere, from Mexico to Chile and the La Plata regions.

As Spanish colonization spread, historical works increased to record events transpiring in New Granada, Venezuela, Chile and La Plata. Among these writings, the history of Bogota by Juan Rodriguez Fresle which was not printed until the nineteenth century, must be regarded as of the highest importance from a literary standpoint, deserving, as it does, an honored place among prose writings of the age.

The religious works of the period were principally catechisms, composed for the instruction of the Indians, often

with the native texts, Aztec, Quechua, Aymará, and so on, together with the Spanish. The first "*Doctrina Cristiana*" was composed by the Dominican Father Pedro de Cordova, in the island of Hispaniola.

The religious, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and others also distinguished themselves as linguists and grammarians, accomplishing the difficult task of learning the Indian language by sound and by practice, and composing grammars and vocabularies.

While these studies of a serious character were pursued, those of a lighter vein were not neglected. Though the novel, as such, did not exist until the nineteenth century, history and fiction were mingled in verse. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries produced a number of historic poems. The *Araucana* of Ercilla y Zúñiga, and the *Arauco Domado* of Pedro de Oña relate the heroic struggle for liberty of the Araucanians, while Juan de Castellanos gives us the history of New Granada in verse. At the same time, Eslava was composing his odes in Mexico, and Bernardo de Valbuena was singing the greatness of Mexico. The "Age of Gold" of the latter is a pastoral poem, written in the spirit of the *Galatea* of Cervantes.

At a somewhat later period, in the seventeenth century, flourished in her convent, Juana Inez de la Cruz, the "Nun of Mexico," a woman of no mean talent who, by her poems, lyric and dramatic, acquired great reputation in her day.

In the meantime, the purity of the Castilian muse, both in Spain and in America, had been diminished by the influx of the bombastic style, known as the *Cultisimo*, or, also, Gongorism, from its author Luis de Gongora, a style that sent its influence to our own times.

Toward the end of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries, Spanish literature on both sides of the Atlantic, underwent a period of decline, while, at the advent of the House of Bourbon to the throne of Spain, French influence made itself strongly felt.

At the end of the eighteenth, and the early part of the



nineteenth centuries, there was a great scientific awakening which had its origin in the College of the Holy Rosary at Santa Fé de Bogota, with which the revolution came to interfere.

During this period of strife, when the colonies were struggling for their independence, the pen was, generally, laid aside for the sword, and though literature still breathed, it languished. From the second decade of the century on, however, it received a new impulse, and every field of literature began to be cultivated with the principal literary centres in Mexico, Bogota, and Santiago de Chile, journalism becoming especially pronounced. The most distinguished writers like Mitre and Bello, at one time or another, tried their hand at periodical literature.

Writers in Spanish-America had great difficulties to contend with. Publishers were scarce, libraries few, and the reading public small. Individuals, even today, often publish their own books, while large and important works are patronized by the government. Yet with all these difficulties, Spanish-American literature is most abundant in every department.

From the beginning of the period of independence, every country has had its historians, with Alaman and Bustamante in Mexico, the Amunateguis and Arana in Chile, Lopez in Argentina, Suarez in Ecuador, and a host of others, too numerous to mention. Gonzalez Saurez, archbishop of Quito, the historian of his country, is one of the most prominent literary men in Spanish-America today.

Among writers of the nineteenth century, two great figures tower above the rest, Bartolomé Mitre in the Argentine Republic, and Andres Bello in Chile. Mitre, warrior, journalist, historian, *savant*, has indelibly inscribed his name on the literary history of Argentina. The services rendered to his country as statesman, as military man, and as president of the Republic, are enhanced by his fame as a writer. The house in which he lived and labored, and in which his career was closed, together with his valuable library, is preserved as he left it, forming, as the "Museo Mitre," one of the treasures of the great city on the La Plata.

Andres Bello, a self-made man, was, to my mind, one of the most extraordinary scholars the Western Hemisphere has produced. In point of erudition, I may, perhaps, compare him to Orestes Brownson. There was hardly a field of literature that Bello did not cultivate. He shone as philosopher, jurist, historian, journalist, and poet, while his civil code of Chile has placed him beside the world's legislators. His statue in Santiago de Chile is an abiding testimony to the gratitude of his adopted country, while Venezuela may be proud of having given him birth.

Political economy has furnished a host of writers to Spanish-America, while forensic oratory has not been lacking in worthy representatives. The venerable Abdon Cifuentes, one of the leaders of the conservative party in Chile, is a prominent representative in the field of eloquence. Cifuentes is, also, a professor at the Catholic University of Santiago.

Although, unlike the colonial period, that of independence has been more prolific in lay than in ecclesiastical writers, the latter have not been wanting. Names like those of Aracena, Errazuriz, Eyzaguirre, Lopez, Tolano, and Suarez are prominent in the history of their respective countries, while the pastorals of the late Archbishop Casanova of Santiago de Chile furnish a wealth of material to the ecclesiastical student.

Lyric poetry has been most abundant in Spanish-America, since the close of the revolutionary period; for most writers, some time or another, ascend the heights of Parnassus. Although no great poem, like the *Araucana*, or the *Lima Fundada* of a bygone age has come to mark an epoch, if we except the *Canton à Junin* of Olmedo which has been regarded as one of the best epics in Spanish, some excellent poets are on record. Arboleda in Colombia, Althaus in Peru, Berro in Uruguay, Echeverria in Argentina, Walker Martinez in Chile, Heredia and Milanés in Cuba are some of the many that will be remembered in the history of the literature.

In literary criticism, we find such names as Gutierrez, Rojas, Caicedo, and Garcia Merou, while our debt to

bibliographers cannot be overestimated. Among the latter, two names are especially prominent, those of the late Garcia Icazbalceta in Mexico, and of Toribio Medina in Chile. The former rendered immense service by his *Bibliography of Sixteenth Century Mexico*, and by his publication of inedited works, not the least of his merits being in his biography of Juan de Zumarraga, the first bishop of Mexico, whose memory he has completely vindicated.

José Toribio Medina is, perhaps, the most copious bibliographer of ancient or modern times, his works constituting a veritable library. Medina has his own printing press in his house, and his Spanish-American library is the most complete in existence. It has furnished him the material for the larger volumes in which he has given us the history of typographical activity in America, of the Inquisition, and of other subjects appertaining to this hemisphere.

In literature of a lighter vein, we have to thank Ricardo Palma, the aged custodian of the *Biblioteca Nacional* of Peru, for his valuable collection of old Peruvian legends and traditions that would otherwise have been lost, though the writer's expressions sometimes grate on our Catholic sensibilities.

In spite of French influence, and of the number of French works that have flooded the markets of Spanish-America, novel writing has had its representatives, as well as the drama. Among dramatists who have been successful, Caldéron, de Górriz, and Galván in Mexico, Gavito in Cuba, Madrid in Colombia, Carpancho in Peru, and Carlos Walker Martínez in Chile, stand prominent.

Novelists of note, among others, are Balcarce, Goriti, Blest Gana, de Cuellar, Altamirano, Lizardi, Orozco y Berra, and Riva Palacio, besides many more. Among novels of prominence must be mentioned the little love tale, idyllic and pure, of George Isaacs of Colombia, entitled *Maria*, and the *Amalia* of José Marmol of Argentina. The former is probably known all through Spanish-America, while, according to the eminent critic, Ferdinand Wolf, the historical novel *Amalia*,



dealing with the period of the dictatorship of Rosas in Buenos Aires, marks an epoch in the history of Spanish-American letters.

Literature still flourishes with our neighbors to the South, though, in some countries, it seems to have declined with the advance of commercialism. Colombia, one of the least progressive of the South American republics from a material standpoint, is one of the most prolific in writers. However the elements of literature are nowhere lacking, and though often the colonial period is forgotten, there are those who look back with pride to their literary inheritance, and return for their inspiration to past ages. Education is increasing, though not always to the benefit of religion; but educational work in Spanish-America is a subject that cannot be drawn into this paper as, in itself, it might furnish an abundant theme. What I have written should suffice to give an idea of the prodigious literary activity, past and present, of Spanish-America.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

## WOMEN WRITERS OF ENGLISH IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.<sup>1</sup>

---

### I.

Anyone who proposes to deal with Women Writers of English in the Fifteenth Century has, in one sense, a comparatively easy task, for the number of such writers known to us is strictly limited and their productions are but few; but if he would place them in their proper setting by showing the conditions prevailing at the time they wrote, he must perforce make a study of an exceedingly disturbed period of English history, and great events and famous names will cross his vision and crowd his page.

When the fifteenth century opened in England Henry IV., the first monarch of the Lancastrian line, was seated somewhat insecurely on the throne and with considerable trepidation wore the crown and wielded the sceptre which, without much ado, he had wrung in 1399 from the nerveless grasp of Richard of Bordeaux. Almost from the outset of his reign Henry was in serious trouble. He was called upon to defend himself from a conspiracy of his nobles; to try, ineffectively, to quell an insurrection in Wales headed by Owen Glendower; to repel an invasion of England by the Scots, whom the Percies of Northumberland defeated for him at Nesbit Moor and Homildon Hill; to put down the revolt of the Percies themselves, which he did at Shrewsbury (1403), where Harry Hotspur fell in one of the most obstinate and bloody battles recorded in English history, and again at Bramham Moor (1408), where the old Earl of Northumberland was defeated and slain; to combat the unrest produced by

<sup>1</sup> This article and its continuation, which will appear in the next number of the *Bulletin*, consist, in substance, of a lecture delivered December 15, 1910, in the series of public lectures organized by the administration of the Catholic University of America.

the growing strength of Lollardy; and, generally, from domestic worries and failure of health, as well as from cares of state, to lead a troubled and harassed life. Nor was his reign free from the terrible visitation of the plague or Black Death, as it was called, which on three different occasions in the time of Edward III.—in 1349, 1361, and 1369—had, if we may believe the estimates, reduced the population by at least two-thirds. In 1400 and 1407 the pestilence broke out again, and wrought fearful havoc.

When Henry IV. died, March 20, 1413, he passed on the succession, still in fact in doubt but to all seeming no longer in dispute, to his son, Henry V., Harry of Monmouth, the great warrior king. In order, probably, to distract attention from the unlineal character of his title to the throne and from the troubles engendered by Lollardy, now fast making headway, Henry V. revived the claims of his great-grandfather to the Kingdom of France, and, in pursuance of his alleged rights, covered his name and race and the arms of England with deathless glory on the field of Agincourt (1415). In his next campaign (1417-1419) he stormed town after town in Normandy, his exploits in the ancient duchy culminating in the capture of Rouen after a six months' siege. Thence he marched, with scarcely any opposition, right up to the gates of Paris, and finally extorted the Treaty of Troyes (1420), by which he won the hand of the French princess Catherine, the regency of France during the lifetime of Charles VI., and the succession to its throne on the death of that insane king. The prospect that opened before the youthful conqueror was magnificent indeed; but death extinguished his high hopes of further earthly glory by taking him off, August 31, 1422, in the thirty-fourth year of his age and the tenth of his reign.

His son, born at Windsor, December 6, 1421, was not quite nine months old when, as Henry VI., he succeeded to the throne of England and to his father's claims on the French crown. On the death of Charles VI. at Paris in October, 1422, the infant Henry was proclaimed king of France, but similar proclamation was made on behalf of the Dauphin,



now Charles VII., who, although at that time he was not master of a fourth part of his kingdom, was anointed and crowned with some solemnity in the city of Poitiers. Thereupon there ensued that fierce and long protracted war which was rendered forever memorable by the siege of Orleans (1428-1429) and its heroic defence and relief by Joan of Arc. The fulfilment of Joan's prediction that she would have Charles VII. anointed and crowned in the cathedral church of Rheims did not, however, bring the fighting to an end. The war dragged spasmodically on to beyond the mid-century mark (1453), and resulted in the final loss to England, not only of the whole of Normandy, Anjou, and Maine, but also of that splendid heritage of the Duchy of Guienne and the County of Poitou, including all the western coast of France from the mouth of the Loire to the foot of the Pyrenees, which Eleanor of Aquitaine had brought as dower to Henry II., so that ultimately nothing of what is modern French soil remained to the English except the town of Calais and a strip of marshy land commanded by its batteries.

Turmoil abroad was succeeded by civil war and intestine broils and something approaching anarchy at home. The Wars of the Roses, which had their origin in the usurpation of Henry IV., began with the first battle of St. Alban's in 1455, and lasted, with occasional intermissions, through thirty years, until Richard III. fell, fighting to the end, and lay stark in death on Bosworth Field (1485). His conqueror, the Earl of Richmond, founder of the Tudor dynasty and a Lancastrian by descent, then held sway in England as Henry VII. He was fortunate enough to make successful resistance to two pretenders to the kingship in the persons of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, and down to his death, which took place in 1509, he displayed so much craftiness in statesmanship that he held almost supreme power in the country. One of his astute acts was to marry Elizabeth, daughter of the Yorkist Edward IV., and thus their son, Henry VIII., united in his own person the rival strains of blood, and so at last reconciled the red rose of Lancaster with the white rose of York.

War, foreign or domestic, was therefore, almost continuous

throughout the greater part of the century. To the terrors of war, moreover, were added the terrors of an extremely disturbed state of society, in which might was mainly right and the strong hand took and held what it could. Burning and harrying and driving and highway robbery and daylight murder were rife. Great lords with their retainers fought pitched battles on their own account. Riots on slight occasion were common. Behind all there was a seething discontent fermenting in the minds of the common people, and seeking an outlet in such forms as the insurrections which broke out in different parts of the kingdom before the fall of the Duke of Suffolk in 1450, and the formidable rising organized by Jack Cade among the men of Kent in the same year.

The nature of the grievances put forward by these insurrectionists has its own significance. Evidently the common people had advanced a stage since the Peasant Revolt under Wat Tyler in the time of Richard II. In 1381 one of the main demands of the commons was the complete abolition of villeinage: in 1450 nothing was said of villeinage, for its legality was no longer absolute. Instead, Cade and his men took higher constitutional ground. They declaimed against the extravagance of the crown, and demanded immediate redress of the abuses of government; they protested against over-taxation; they claimed the right to choose their own representatives in parliament without let or hindrance from the nobility.

With a larger personal and political liberty the peasantry had also acquired a corresponding increase in the means and comforts of domestic life. The rise in the wages of agricultural laborers which took place between 1388 and 1444 appears to have led even to some extravagance in living and dress, which it was thought necessary to restrain by the enactment of sumptuary laws. For example, it was ordered that no laborer should appear in broadcloth costing more than two shillings a yard; that his hosen, consisting of breeches and stockings in one piece, should not cost more than fourteen pence; and that his wife should no longer wear a silver-ornamented girdle or display her vanity by donning a head-

covering made of cloth value for more than twelve pence per plight. Domestic servants, too, appear to have been fairly comfortably off. We are told that, in the matter of food at all events, they lived well, having one substantial meal a day of flesh or fish, with sundry other meals of milk, butter, cheese, and bread. As for drink, the eminent fifteenth century lawyer, Sir John Fortescue, informs us that in his time the commons of England fared so abundantly that they seldom drank water unless for penance.

While the whole nation was frantic over the loss of Normandy, Maine, and Anjou, and especially of Guienne, the masses of the people do not appear to have been particularly concerned with the result of the Wars of the Roses. Occasionally, indeed, they displayed great enthusiasm, as when they flocked to the standard of Warwick the Kingmaker on his landing from France (1470) to champion the cause of Margaret of Anjou and her son, Prince Edward; but as a rule, if it was not exactly a case of "a plague o' both your houses," their attitude was one of supreme indifference as to whether they were ruled by Lancaster or York. Hence the Wars of the Roses, which decimated the nobility and laid feudalism low, seem to have interfered but little with the ordinary occupations of the bulk of the populace. They tilled and reaped, and bought and sold, just as if a crown were not hanging in the balance. Neither did they forgo their usual amusements, so that, despite many depressing circumstances, the country to a great degree still deserved the name of "Merry England." Mystery and miracle plays afforded at once pleasure and instruction. Exercise with the quarter-staff was almost universal. Running, wrestling, pitching the bar, and spear-throwing, going out of fashion with the upper classes, were ardently taken up by the lower. Tennis—a very different game from the modern one of lawn tennis—bull-baiting, cock-fighting, balloon-ball, club-ball, trap-ball, foot ball, base or bars, hoodman blind, boating, skating, fishing, hunting, hawking, and archery were all pursued with zest by different orders of the people. Medicine and surgery were not much in vogue: there was, for instance, only one



English surgeon at Agincourt, and to him were assigned fifteen unskilful and very unwilling assistants to attend to the wounds of the 1,600 Englishmen who fell on that glorious field. On the other hand, as might be expected from a disturbed state of society, in which questions of title to lands and tenements were continually coming up, law was a lucrative calling and was extensively practised. We shall see in a moment how the writings of which I am to treat centre around some of these amusements and professions.

From this hastily sketched and imperfect picture it might with some show of reason be inferred that, taken all in all, the fifteenth century in England was but little favorable to culture in general and to the growth and development of literature in particular. That is the general opinion concerning it at any rate. In many manuals of literary history it is described as dull and uninteresting, a barren waste as contrasted with the Chaucerian period, which had immediately preceded it, on the one hand, and the Elizabethan period, which was so soon to follow it, on the other. This description, however, like most other sweeping generalizations, has the disadvantage of conveying a really erroneous impression. It is about on a par with the condemnation of the middle ages, because they lie between the glories of classical antiquity and the effulgence of modern times. But all critics are not so prejudiced. A saner and doubtless a juster judgment is beginning to be formulated. Thus Mr. A. R. Waller, in his final words on the fifteenth century, has this to say:—

“It would rather appear that a century, the beginning of which saw the English Mandeville translators at work, and the end of which saw one of those versions printed; a century to which may be credited *The Flower and the Leaf*, the Paston letters, Caxton's prefaces and translations, the immortal Malory, lyrics innumerable, sacred and secular, certain ballads, in the main, as we now know them, *The Nut Brown Maid* (in itself sufficient, in form and music and theme, to ‘make the fortune’ of any century), carols and many of the miracle plays in their present form, can well hold its own in the history of our literature as against the centuries that precede or follow

it. At least it is not deficient either in variety of utterance or in many-sidedness of interest. It is not merely full of the promise that all periods of transition possess, but its actual accomplishment is not to be contemned, and its products are not devoid either of humour or beauty."<sup>2</sup>

It is not for me on the present occasion to descant at large on the very numerous and undoubtedly important contributions to English literature which the fifteenth century has to show. I am, on the contrary, to confine myself to an infinitesimal portion of the writings of that age—a portion, too, to which it is doubtful how far the term literature in its true signification may with propriety be applied at all. But as all beginnings are important and are deserving of painstaking investigation, so I think the beginning of the writing of English by women is justly entitled to consideration, especially when we bear in mind the range of positive achievement which in the centuries that have since intervened women writers were to attain, and the high position which in our own day they have won for themselves in the republic of letters.

I have always been of opinion that, if we could ever get to know the facts, it would be found that in the middle ages English women wrote much more than we are now aware of. It is almost impossible to conceive that, in the stately homes of England and in convents and nunneries throughout the land, there were not many gentlewomen who burned with devotional enthusiasm or poetic fire, and who managed to deliver through the medium of the pen to their own little world the thoughts of which their souls were pregnant. We know that as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century the study of religious writers is expressly enjoined upon recluses in the *Ancren Riwele* ("Anchoresses' Rule"); and what more natural than that some of them, inspired by such reading and feeling that they too had a message to convey, should commit to writing the ideas and aspirations that surged through their minds? One of the spiritual descendants of the mystic Richard Rolle of Hampole, namely, Walter Hylton (d. 1396), the August-

<sup>2</sup> *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. II., pp. 486-487.

tinian canon of Thurgarton in Nottinghamshire, in his beautiful work, the *Scala Perfectionis* or *The Ladder of Perfection*, lets fall the incidental remark, "this readeest thou in every book that teacheth of good living," which has been interpreted to prove the existence in the fourteenth century of many a manuscript containing spiritual reading which has not come down to us at all or has come down only in fragmentary form. Of the writings of that age, so far undiscovered, it needs no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that some were from the hands of women, and if there be any truth in this supposition for the fourteenth century, it would be, inferentially, at least equally true of the fifteenth.

It is at all events now certain that the claim sometimes put forward for Dame Juliana Berners that she is the first of the long line of women writers of English can no longer be sustained, and that that honour, so far as we at present know, appears to belong to another Juliana—Juliana of Norwich. This excellent lady was an anchoress of that ancient city, and according to the account usually received—but now received with some question—she is believed to have lived for at least a century, from 1342 to 1442. Nearly as long a span used to be assigned to Juliana's master in mysticism, Hylton himself, and to Juliana Berners, and such an ascription is by no means inherently improbable. It would go to prove that in the middle ages, as in the early ages of the Christian Church, the religious and especially the contemplative life was a healthy one and conduced to vigorous old age. The work which establishes Juliana of Norwich's priority is entitled *XVI Revelations of Divine Love Shewed to Mother Juliana of Norwich*, 1373. It exists in two manuscripts, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and the other in the British Museum in London. It was first printed by H. Cressy (Dom Serenus Cressy, O. S. B.) in 1670, and was reprinted in 1845. It had, however, escaped general attention, so that Father Dalgairns, writing in 1870, speaks of it as "a hitherto almost unknown work," and in another place he says that it "remained comparatively unknown." Hence it eluded the notice of the compilers of text books, and thus led to the



error to which I have referred. It has since been printed in 1877, 1901, and 1902.

Juliana saw for the first time in 1373 the vision from which she derived her *Revelations*, and she is supposed to have written down her account of it in 1393, so that she falls just outside the century with which we are immediately concerned. Let me, however, say here in passing that hers is a remarkable work. Students of mysticism cannot afford to neglect it, and any one who wishes for further proof of how divine love triumphs over everything has here a splendid illustration.

Proceeding to Dame Juliana Berners, we are at once confronted with many difficulties and doubts. She is by some modern writers considered rather a mythical personage. Usually, however, she is described as the Prioress of Sopwell Nunnery, and is said to have been born towards the end of the fourteenth century at Roding-Berners, in the hundred of Dunmow, and county of Essex, and to have been the daughter of that Sir James Berners who was beheaded on Tower Hill in 1388 as one of the evil counsellors of Richard II.

The family of Berners—the name is spelled variously Barnes, Bernes, Barners, and Berners—was of considerable honour and antiquity. The founder of the house was Hugh Berners, or de Berners, a great Norman of the eleventh century, who held a hide of land in Eversden in the county of Cambridge as certified to by Domesday Book made in the twentieth year of William the Conqueror's reign (1085). Various members of the family rose to eminence. One female line gave to church and state Stephen Langton (c. 1150-1228), cardinal priest of St. Chrysogonus and forty-fourth Archbishop of Canterbury, who played so important a part in obtaining Magna Charta from King John. In literature the family is also splendidly represented, again through the female line, by Sir John Bouchier, Lord Berners. On the execution of Sir James Berners in 1388 his blood was attainted and his Essex estates were confiscated, but there was a partial restoration of the property to his widow in the following year, and the family was restored in blood in 1398. Sir James's son, Sir Richard, created Baron Berners in the reign of Henry

IV., left a daughter and sole heir, Margery Berners, who took for her second husband Sir John Bouchier. He was summoned to Parliament in 1455 as Lord Berners in right of his wife, *jure uxoris*. Their son, Sir Humphrey Bouchier, was slain at the battle of Barnet in 1471, during his father's lifetime, leaving a son, Sir John Bouchier, who in 1474 succeeded his grandfather as Lord Berners, and is known to all lovers of literature as a translator on a grand scale, his most notable work in that line being of course his rendering of the Chronicles of Froissart from the French.

Sopwell nunnery, of which Juliana Berners was prioress, was a dependency of the great abbey of St. Alban's, and was founded as far back as 1140. Two women religiously inclined made themselves a habitation by raddling boughs of trees with wattles and stakes close to Einwood and within the precincts of the Abbey of St. Alban's, and there passed their time in continual acts of devotion, severe abstinence, and strict chastity. Soon Geoffrey de Gorham, sixteenth abbot of St. Alban's, erected them into a cell subordinate to the mother abbey, and directed them to adopt the garment of nuns according to the order of St. Benedict. The nunnery so established had a continuous existence until in the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII. it was confiscated, and the site and buildings were granted to Sir Richard Lee. At present it belongs to the Earl of Verulam. The nuns' fishponds, now overgrown with water lilies, still stand in a part of the grounds. According to received tradition the two pioneer women of the community used to dip their dry bread in the water of an ancient holy well adjoining, and hence the place was called Sopwell.

It is not certain at what date Dame Berners became head of Sopwell nunnery, but we know that one prioress was elected in 1426 and another was superseded on account of old age in 1480, and very probably she came in somewhere between the two, if indeed she was not the superseded one.

The work by virtue of which she is entitled to notice from students of literary history is known as *The Boke of St. Alban's*. Caxton had established the first printing press in England at Westminster in 1476, and speedily found imitators. In 1478

a press was set up at Oxford, in 1480 another was established in London, and in 1479 or 1480 a "sometime schoolmaster of St. Alban's," whose name is unknown, but who is often called "John Insomuch" because two of his productions commenced with that word, started a press there, printing altogether eight books of which we have record. One of these was the volume which goes by the name of *The Boke of St. Alban's*. It contained three treatises, the first on hawking, the second on hunting, and the third on coat-armour or heraldry. The treatise on hunting, which is in rhymed verse, has for colophon: "Explicit [Here ends] Dam Julyans Barnes in her boke of hunting." On the strength of this statement the authorship of the whole book has been assigned to her, but there is really nothing to show whether she did or did not write the other two treatises.

For my own part I see no reason why she could not have been the author or, to speak more correctly perhaps, the compiler of the whole *Boke of St. Alban's*. All three subjects would come well within her purview as the daughter of a noble house, trained up from youth in the accomplishments and indoor and outdoor sports and occupations belonging to her rank in society. Some writers, assuming that the good Juliana practised as a nun what she preached as a writer, have styled her "a second Minerva in her studies and another Diana in her diversions"; others, as already stated, have raised doubt of her authorship and even of her existence. Between the two extremes of opinion the truth probably lies. The colophon I have mentioned, as well as unbroken tradition, would appear to establish satisfactorily the two facts (1) that there was a real Juliana Berners, and (2) that she is responsible at least for the treatise on hunting. Bale in his *Scriptorum Illustrum majoris Brytanniae Catalogus*, printed at Basel in 1559, gives a special paragraph to her, enumerates her works, and says that she flourished (*floruit*) in 1460 in the reign of Henry VI. With regard to the other point, it is true indeed that Chaucer represents a Benedictine prioress as riding with some attendant nuns and priests on the celebrated pilgrimage to the shrine of the

"holy blisful martir" at Canterbury, but a pilgrimage, even in Chaucer's conception of it, is a very different thing from a fox-hunt, and there certainly is no need for our supposing that the prioress of Sopwell periodically sallied forth from the seclusion of her nunnery to engage in the sport of hawking or to ride horseback across country in pursuit of fox, or hare, or deer.

The dates indeed are slightly awkward; but let us, by no far-fetched idea, suppose her to have been a mere infant at her father's death; to have been brought up in the way that befitted a young gentlewoman in those days; to have acquired in a convent school or from domestic tutors some book-learning, writing, and drawing, as well as needlework, confectionery, and the rudiments of surgery and physic, for apothecaries and surgeons were, as we have seen, rare at that time; next, when emancipated from the school-room, to have passed some time with relatives in the vicinity of the court and to have taken her own part in field sports, then as now a favorite amusement with ladies of family; to have kept a commonplace book of recipes and notes such as was usual down to comparatively recent times with women who could write; to have found a religious vocation and retired from the world—and we have just the ideal preparation for the composition of such a work as the *Boke of St. Alban's*.

We can picture the good nun sitting down in her leisure time, and, with the benefit and instruction of some kinsman perhaps in view, amusing herself by versifying the rules of hunting, by adding thereto points gained from her own previous experience, and by extending her notes on hawking and heraldry, using in all cases, in conformity with the practice of the time, whatever of previously existing material came to hand. For, whoever wrote the *Boke of St. Alban's*, nothing more can be claimed for it than that it is in great part a translation and compilation. The treatise on heraldry is expressly said to have been translated and compiled at St. Alban's, its principal source in all probability being a work on the same subject written in 1441 by Nicholas Upton, and the major portion



of the treatises on hawking and hunting is derived from the early fourteenth century work, the *Venerie de Twety*.

In opposition to my own theory that Juliana composed the *Boke of St. Alban's* in its entirety as it at first appeared, it is only fair that I should say that some writers, who admit both her existence and her authorship, limit her writing to the treatise on hunting. Others would give her a little more. Thus Joseph Haslewood, who in 1810 produced a fac-simile of the second edition (1496) of the *Boke of St. Alban's*—a scarce work which I had the opportunity of examining in detail in the British Museum in London last August—has gone very carefully into the question of authorship, and he assigns to her a small portion of the treatise on hawking; all the treatise on hunting; a short list of the beasts of the chase; and another short list of Persons, Beasts, Fowls, &c.

In 1496 Jan Wynkyn de Worde, Caxton's successor, reprinted the *Boke of St. Alban's* with the addition of a treatise on fishing. The object of the addition was doubtless to make the work more saleable and therefore more valuable commercially as being a kind of complete "Gentleman's *Vade Mecum*," for in its later form it gave just the information which a gentleman might be likely to need. Evidently it supplied a want, for it was in great demand. It continued to be very popular throughout the sixteenth century and was frequently reprinted, as, for example, by Gervase Markham in 1595, under the title of *The Gentleman's Academie, or the Booke of St. Alban's*.

A few extracts to show the nature and quality of the work which the prioress of Sopwell composed at least 425 years ago will not come amiss. The first is taken from the treatise on hawking. Observe how severely practical it is. Observe too the varied and irregular character of the spelling:—

"And if yowre hawke be harde pennyd [strongly feathered] she may be drawne to be reclaymed [pulled by a string to be taught to come back]. For all the while that she is tender pennyd she is not habull to be reclaymed. And if she be a Goshawke or Tercell that shall be reclaymed ever fede hym

[sic] with washe mete at the drawyng and at the reclaymyng, bot loke that hit be hoote, and in this manner washe it. Take the meet and go to the water and strike it upp and downe in the water and wringe the waater owte and fede her therwith and [if] she be a brawncher [a hawk just able to leave its nest]. And if it bene an Eyesse [a hawk reared in captivity] thow most wash the meete clenner than ye doo to the brawncher, and with a linne [linen] cloth wipe it and fede hir, &c."

The second extract is from the treatise on coat armour, dealing with the origin of nobility:—

*"How Gentilmen shall be knowyn from churlis and how they first began.*—Now for to devyde gentilmen from chorlis in haast it shall be preved. Ther was never gentilman nor churle ordeyned by kynde [nature] bot he had fadre and modre. Adam and Eve had nother fadre nor modre, and in the sonnys of Adam and Eve war found bothe gentilman and churle. By the sonnys of Adam and Eve, Seth, Abell and Cayn, devyded was the royall blode fro the ungentill. A brother to sleigh his brother contrary to the law where myght be more ungentelnes? By that did Cayn become a chorle and all his ofspryng after him, by the cursing of God and his owne fadre Adam. And Seth was made a gentilman thorow his fadres and moderis blessing. And of the ofspryng of Seth Noe came a gentilman by kinde and lineage."

The next extract from the same treatise tells the vices which a gentleman must particularly avoid:—

*"There be IX vices contrary to gentilmen.*—Ther ben IX vices contrari to gentilmen, of the wiche V ben indeterminable and IIII determynable. The V indeterminable ben theys: oon to be full of slowthe in his werris, an other to be full of boost in his manhode, the thride to be full of cowardnes to his enemy, the fourth to be full of lechri in his body, and the fifthe to be full of drynkyng and dronckunli. There be IIII determynable: on is to revoke his own chalange, an other to slay his presoner with his own handis, the thride to voyde from his soueraynes baner in the felde, and the fifthe [sic] to tell his soueraygne fals talys."

A final extract is taken from that part of the treatise which deals with the blasing of arms:—

*“Here begynneth the blasynge of armys. — I have shewyd to yow in thys book a-foore how gentilmen began, and how the law of armys was first ordant, and how moni colowris ther be in cootarmuris, and the difference of cootarmuris with mony other thinggis that here needis not to be rehersed. Now I intende to procede of signys in armys and of the blasynge of all armys. Bot for to reherce all the signys that be borne in armys, as Pecok, Pye, Batt, Dragon, Lyon, and Dolfyn, and flowris and leevys, it war to longe a tariyng, ner I can not do hit: ther be so mony. Bot here shall shortli be shewyd to blase all armys if ye entende diligentli to youre rulys. And be cause the cros is the moost worthi signe emong al signys in armys: at the cros I will begynne, in the wich thys nobull and myghtie prince King Arthure hadde grete trust, so that he lefte his armys that he bare of III Dragonys, and over that an other sheelde of III crownys, and toke to his armys a crosse of silver in a feelde of verte [green], and on the right side an ymage of owre blessid lady with hir sone in hir arme. And with that signe of the cros he dyd mony maruelis after, as hit is writyn in the bookis of cronyclis of his dedys.*

*“Also I have read this sign of the cross to be sende from God to that blessed man Marcuri as Vincencius saith in speculo historiali, of the marvellous death of Julian the apostate emperour, lib. XX he sayth the angel brought unto the foresaid Marcuri all armour necessary with a shield of azure and a cross fleuri with IIIJ roses of gold, as here in this, and I found never that ever any arms were sent from heaven but in them was the sign of the cross. Except in the arms of the King of France the which arms certainly was sent by an angel from heaven, that is to say IIJ flowers in manner of swords in a field of azure, as it shews here, the which certain arms were given to the foresaid King of France in sign of everlasting trouble and that he and his successors always with battle and swords should be punished.”*

There is evidently a quaint interest attaching to some of the

contents of the book, but on the whole one is more fascinated by the mystery surrounding its authorship than by any literary merits it possesses. Like many other didactic works, it is lacking in art. It attracts us not because it is beautiful but simply because it is old.

*(To be continued.)*

P. J. LENNOX.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



## THE FATHERS ON WEALTH AND PROPERTY.

---

The publication of the Edict of Milan by Constantine in the early part of the year 313 A. D., which assured to the Christians in the Roman Empire legal toleration and the right freely to practise their religion, marked merely one successful stage in the conflict with heathenism. Political disabilities were removed: but much still remained to be done. Philosophy had to be moulded in order to make of it an adequate medium for the approximate expression of Christian truth and society had to be transformed in order to secure a favorable environment for the expression of Christian life. The spirit of heathenism in law was annulled; but the spirit of heathenism in life and thought was still active and flourishing. All the forces of the decaying pagan life had been drawn together in the Philosophy of the neo-Platonists, and used as a means to combat the advance of Christianity. A more serious menace, however, presented itself when heathenism raised its head within the Christian fold itself in the two great heresies of Arianism and Pelagianism. Both schemes were rooted in the same unchristian ideas of God and law, in the same heathen and mechanical conception of sin, in the same naturalism and rationalism.

In other spheres of life heathenism was still equally vigorous. "It was still an established religion, receiving state support till the time of Gratian, a vast and venerable system. The Emperor was still its official head during life; and even Theodosius was formally placed among the gods at his death. Old Rome was still devoted to her ancient deities, her nobles still recorded their priesthoods and augurships among their proudest honors, and the senate itself still opened every meeting with an offering of incense on the altar of Victory. The public service was largely heathen, from its lowest ranks up to the prefectures of Rome and Constantinople. The army was full of heathens, both Roman and barbarian, though Chris-

tians were not a few even among the paladins of Julian. Education was mostly heathen, turning on heathen classics and taught by heathen rhetoricians, like Themistius, the king of eloquence, or Libanius the honored friend of Basil as well as Julian. Above all society was heathen to an extent we can scarcely realize."<sup>1</sup> More and more as time went on and as their numbers increased, the Christians were brought into contact with this all-pervading heathenism, and graver became the responsibilities which rested on them of defining the scope and application of Christian principles to the hoary social institutions of Rome under the watchful and jealous eyes of their pagan censors. The fact that the Christians were permitted by law to assemble without fear of molestation and that they were allowed to build and own churches had produced no change in the prevailing social or economic outlook. Property was still held by the old titles and was still looked on in the traditional pagan way, and the callous individualism which had found expression in absolute ownership still prevailed. In the eyes of the law no new value had been placed on human life: labor was still held in contempt: and as formerly taxes were imposed and collected with the same sublime disregard for the rights of the taxpayer.

In forming an estimate, therefore, of the attitude taken by the Christians towards wealth and property and the administration of finances, public as well as private, in the period immediately following the era of the persecutions, it will be necessary constantly to bear in mind the circumstances of the time. The evils of an economic character to which they called attention and for which they offered a remedy had not escaped the notice of pagan statesmen and moralists. The enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, the increasing poverty, the avarice of usurers, the devastation and depopulation of large tracts of territory, the cruelty and exactions of taxgatherers had found many opponents from the days of Seneca onwards and had frequently been the object of corrective legislation. The Christians did not concern them-

<sup>1</sup> H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 58.

selves directly with economic affairs. Their energies were sufficiently taxed to maintain the purity of their doctrines in face of new heresies, and to provide for the spread and organisation of the Church. Confronted, however, as they were on all sides with the expiring spirit of heathenism, and forced to awaken in the faithful a sense of responsibility towards a social organism which was rapidly becoming Christian, they were compelled, as well by the increasing number of converts, as from the fact that the bishops were coming to be looked on as the "*defensores civitatum*" the natural protectors of the weak and the oppressed—to take a decided stand on matters of social and economic import. Questions of conscience arose regarding the disposition of wealth, the rights of the poor had to be considered and above all it was necessary to safeguard the teachings of the Christian religion against the attacks of the heathens who were asserting that the decay of the Empire and the universal misery were due to the abandonment of the old gods. The enormous difficulties implied in transforming the old Roman state into something approximating a Christian commonwealth cannot be easily defined; but it is significant that just a century after the Church received legal toleration in Rome, St. Augustine commenced his work on "The City of God." The composition of this work, marks another stage in the struggle with paganism. If the earthly city was not already realized, the possibility of its attainment was present to the minds of the Christians, and the pagan accusations which called for the great work in which it was described were the despairing cries of defeat. It is futile to discuss the influence which St. Augustine's work had in helping to bring about the state which he described, but in all subsequent Christian writings we find little which is not moulded by his thought or borrowed directly from him. The last blow to pagan pride was administered when Alaric captured Rome, and even if there were pagans enough left to trouble the Christians by attributing to their religion that calamity, the strength of paganism had vanished, and henceforth, owing to the influence of St. Augustine and the extinction of pagan

institutions, we do not find in the writings of the Christians many expressions which need to be interpreted in the light of the special circumstances which provoked them. These circumstances are frequently lost sight of by some advocates of communism and socialism, who wishing to enlist the Fathers among their advocates, forget the fundamental canons of historical criticism, and take isolated statements in their writings, and with no regard to the occasion which called them forth, make them do service as expressions of principle. Thus we find Nitti asserting that: "The doctrines held by the early Fathers of the Church on the nature of property are perfectly uniform. They almost all admit that wealth is the fruit of usurpation, and, considering the rich man as holding the patrimony of the poor, maintain that riches should only serve to relieve the indigent; to refuse to assist the poor is, consequently, worse than to rob the rich. According to the fathers, all was in common in the beginning: the distinctions *mine* and *thine*, in other words, individual property, came with the spirit of evil."<sup>2</sup> The same or similar assertions are found in a large number of other writers, some of whom are not partial to the tenets of Socialism, but all of whom are misled by what is looked on as a communistic tone in certain passages of the writings of some of the early fathers.<sup>3</sup>

Of Communism as now generally understood, it may be asserted, there is not a trace in the writings of the early Christian fathers. They never express themselves as desiring to subvert the established political order and they never assail vested rights. No statement of theirs can be taken to mean that they had in mind some new social scheme and they constantly preach peace and contentment. In fact when they do express themselves on social and political matters, it is to point out remedies for evils which were undermining the state, and had their preaching been generally observed there

<sup>2</sup> *Catholic Socialism*, p. 66 seq.

<sup>3</sup> Laveleye, *Le socialisme contemporain*, p. xvii. Laurent, *Principes du droit civil*, t. vi, p. 119. Bouctot, *Histoire du Communisme et du Socialisme*, p. 8 seq. Adler, *Geschichte des Sozialismus und Kommunismus von Plato bis zur Gegenwart*, p. 76 seq.



can be no doubt but that the old order would have survived the shock of barbarian invasion. If their teaching has been misunderstood it is due either to the subjectivity of a certain school of propagandists who find everywhere confirmation for their opinions, or to the fact that no attention is paid to the times and circumstances in which the fathers lived and to the peculiarly unchristian character which still inhered in many of the laws and institutions in the fourth and fifth centuries. In order to arrive at a just basis for judging some phases of the economic utterances of the fathers it is essential to have a clear conception of some economic features during the two centuries which preceded the fall of the Western Empire.

It is a truism among historians that at no point did Roman imperial administration fail so lamentably as in fiscal matters. Desperate expedients were resorted to at various times to provide for the maintenance of government and to ward off national bankruptcy. Nothing that had previously been attempted was so far-reaching, nor so fatal perhaps, as the measures introduced by Diocletian and Constantine, "by which at the beginning of the fourth century the old municipal curia or senate was metamorphosed into a machine for grinding down the provincial proprietors by a most unmerciful and injudicious system of taxation. The curia of a town consisted of a certain number of the richest landowners who were responsible to the treasury for a definite sum, which it was their business to collect from all the proprietors of the district."<sup>4</sup>

The ruinous effect of this legislation can be readily seen from the fact that at all times, but especially in the fourth and fifth centuries all wealth in the Roman Empire was derived from landed possessions and agricultural pursuits. For purposes of taxation, the slaves and the plebeian class consisting of free artizans, shopkeepers, etc., could not be taken into consideration, and because trade and commerce had languished to such an extent that the merchant class was almost extinct,<sup>5</sup> the entire fiscal burden fell on the Curiales and the members

<sup>4</sup> Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. I, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> Duruy, *Hist. Rom.*, VI, 378. De Coulanges, *L'Inv. Ger.*, 102.

of the senatorial class. The Curiales were the middle class, they were described as the *nervi reipublicae ac viscera civitatum*,<sup>6</sup> they were admitted to the municipal curia not because as formerly they had filled important magistracies through the election of their fellow-citizens, but because they were land-owners, who owned more than twenty-five jugera. On them devolved all the expenses and responsibility of municipal administration, and, what was more onerous, the responsibility for the collection and payment of the imperial tax assessment in their district. So heavy were these burdens that the declining years of Rome saw no more sorry spectacle than what has been called "the flight of the curiales." By every conceivable device they sought escape from their grinding obligations. They enrolled in the army or the Palatine service or if wealthy they bought admission to the Senatorial order, they degraded themselves to the plebeian class or, what was more deplorable, they surrendered their holdings to some wealthier neighbor and sank practically to the condition of serfs. The imperial authorities sought by means of legislation to stop this depletion of the ranks of the curiales. Admission to the Senatorial class was denied them,<sup>7</sup> and numerous enactments framed by which their condition was reduced to that of imperial serfs. They were not allowed to absent themselves from their homes, even for the shortest period without the permission of the imperial authorities, they could neither sell nor dispose of their property, they could not take up other occupations, and if they died intestate their estate went to the municipality. The list of their disabilities extended even to denying them the asylum of the Church thus placing them in the category of fugitive slaves and insolvent debtors. Two evil consequences resulted from this depletion of the curial class, the burdens became heavier on those who could not escape, and the amount of land under cultivation constantly decreased, thus adding to the universal misery.

The decay of the middle class composed of the curiales was accompanied by a movement in the opposite direction among

<sup>6</sup> Majorian, *Nov.*, I.

<sup>7</sup> *Cod. Theod.*, XII, 1, 183. Theodosius, *Novella*, 8.

the members of the senatorial class whose wealth and prestige were constantly increasing. Though the senators were no longer public functionaries, the title senator being merely a badge of social distinction, membership in the order was so eagerly sought for, no less because of the rank it conferred than for the privileges and exemptions it conveyed, that from the time of Constantine the number of those enjoying senatorial honors had been constantly increasing. The prohibitions of later emperors against the admission of curiales to the senatorial order gave to the latter all the more repulsive features of a caste. They enjoyed a practical monopoly of the higher offices, and because of their wealth and cohesiveness they were in a position to exclude others from the more important posts in the public service. In the utter financial prostration of the later Empire two causes contributed to enhance enormously the wealth of this aristocratic class. In the first place, they were secured through their possession of large estates in various parts of the world against the uncertainty of bad crops and the ruin of excessive taxation, and were thus in a position to constantly increase their holdings at the expense of their less fortunate neighbors. The burden of taxation compelled the small proprietors to borrow money at usurious rates from the *potentes* as they were called, and being unable to meet their obligations, they were dispossessed by means of forced sales or compelled absolutely to surrender their holdings and to be reduced to the unenviable position of *coloni*. In this manner the free middle class was gradually reduced to poverty, and wealth and power passed into the hands of the great landowners. The transfer, however, could not have been effected except through the connivance of the government officials and the utter shamelessness and venality of the provincial authorities. "A volume," says Dill,<sup>8</sup> "might be written on the subject of

<sup>8</sup> *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 270. In his chapter on the "Decay of the Middle Class and the Aggrandisement of the Aristocracy," Dill elaborates this phase of the social conditions in Rome from a study of the Theodosian code with a view to showing that moral and economic vice "far more than the violent intrusion of the German invaders produced the collapse of society which is known as the fall of the Empire of the West."

financial corruption in the last century of the Western Empire. When one wanders through the maze of enactments dealing with fiscal oppression, malversation, and evasion, one knows not whether more to pity the weakness of the government, or to wonder at the hardened cupidity and audacity of the classes which were leagued together in plundering both the treasury and the taxpayer."

Through the venality of the official class the wealthy land-owners were enabled systematically to oppress and rob the poor, who, if not deprived of their property, were compelled to bear an unequal and unjust share of taxation. On the other hand the system of pilfering public funds and defrauding the taxpayer, as revealed by the enactments of the Theodosian code, shows a condition and quality of crime which would not have been possible, had not public morality and governmental activity been utterly lacking. "The system of bureaucratic despotism, elaborated finally by Diocletian and Constantine, produced a tragedy in the truest sense, such as history has seldom exhibited; in which, by an inexorable fate, the claims of fancied omnipotence ended in a humiliating paralysis of administration, in which determined effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them till they became unendurable; in which the best intentions of the central power were, generation after generation, mocked and defeated alike by irresistible laws of human nature, and by hopeless perfidy and corruption in the servants of government." <sup>9</sup>

It would be an obvious injustice to cast the responsibility for this condition of widespread suffering on the Emperors and their advisers. The causes which produced it were beyond the reach of legislative remedies and were rooted in the lives and institutions of the people, which were still colored by the spirit of paganism. The causes were moral rather than economic. In the first place the absolute title to property which sufficiently safeguarded the rights of the owners could not arouse them to a sense of their duties and obligations, and

<sup>9</sup> Dill, *Ibid.*, p. 281.



in the second place the cold and selfish individualism which dominated conduct, excluded all feeling of corporate or humane responsibility.

Though the Christian writers did not directly concern themselves with economic problems, they cannot be denied the credit of having correctly diagnosed the situation, and of having offered remedies adequate to the current needs. They were unsparing in their denunciation of the avarice and corruption of the times and unwearied in their efforts to arouse in their contemporaries a sense of duty and responsibility to others. In one treatise of the period, the "*De Gubernatione Dei*" of Salvian,<sup>10</sup> there is a striking account of the impression produced on the earnest minded Christians by this universal misery. Written with the purpose of showing that the barbarian invasions and the general suffering were no proof that God had abandoned His providential care over men, Salvian points out that the humiliation of the Romans was an evidence of divine government and a punishment for evildoing. The rich he accuses of murder, oppression and robbery. The dignities of the great mean the robbery of cities; prefects are plunderers. Honors are purchased by a few to be paid for by the spoliation of all; the lowly pay the price of dignities for which they did not bargain. The world is in constant turmoil because a few enjoy honors and authority. The community suffers for the glory of one man. The poor have no greater scourge than the civil power.<sup>11</sup> The morals of the rich are worse than those of the slaves.<sup>12</sup> Immunity from punishment makes them murderers.<sup>13</sup> Their homes are dens of iniquity and immorality.<sup>14</sup> The poor, on the contrary groaned under the burden of excessive taxation and unjust imposts.<sup>15</sup> In cases

<sup>10</sup> Salvian was born near Cologne about the end of the fourth century, and after being ordained to the priesthood he entered the monastery at Lerins. He died about 480 A. D.

<sup>11</sup> *De Gubernatione Dei*, IV, 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, n. 6.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 5.

<sup>14</sup> VII, 3. *Quis potentum ac divitum non in luto libidinis vixit? quis non se barathro sordidissimae conluvionis inmersit? quis conjugii fidem reddidit?*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 7.

where the Emperors lightened the taxes, the rich enjoyed all the benefits by paying nothing and by compelling the poor to assume the entire responsibility.<sup>16</sup> Widows were in tears, the unprotected were robbed, the orphans were homeless.<sup>17</sup> Many even of the better class fled to the enemy in order to escape this official persecution. They preferred to live free though appearing to be prisoners than in apparent freedom to become slaves.<sup>18</sup> In business affairs deceit and injustice prevailed everywhere.<sup>19</sup> Lying, misrepresentation and perjury were considered to be legitimate provided they were profitable. So widespread were these evils that many Christians were no better than the heathens and barbarians.<sup>20</sup> The whole congregation at Rome with the exception of a few was a sink of vice.<sup>21</sup>

To remedy these evils and to restore order to the world, Salvian proposes in the first place that men should learn how to practise justice and uprightness in public as well as private life. The poor should not be made to suffer, and if taxes are remitted or reduced they should be allowed to enjoy the benefits of this concession.<sup>22</sup> In the second place he calls attention to the necessity of cultivating a wholesome public spirit, of being zealous for the general welfare, of submerging all desire for personal aggrandisement in zeal for the well-being of the community.<sup>23</sup> The duty of those in authority is to provide for the people at large, to work for the common good, to remember that poor public officials made Rome great, as the rich were its destruction.<sup>24</sup>

Those results could be attained only through the practice of fraternal charity, by which the individual places himself and his resources at the service of others. No one should shut himself off in selfish isolation. If he has riches and

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 6; V, 8.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 19.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 8. Nam sicut sunt in adgravatione pauperes primi, ita in relevatione postremi.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 2.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 5.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 14.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 44.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 2.

property he should look on them as gifts from God of which for a brief period he is the steward and administrator.<sup>25</sup>

Confronted with such economic paralysis and no doubt feeling as keenly on the subject of the miseries of the poor as did Salvian, the fathers could not be insensible to the duty which rested on them of striving to relieve as far as possible the prevailing distress. In common with the framers of the Theodosian Code, whose efforts for social betterment are seen on every page, they could not escape the conviction that the fabric of Roman society was being undermined by the greed and rapacity of the great landowners. To understand fully the attitude they took towards wealth and property, and to bring out in stronger relief their thorough conservativeness, it must be borne in mind that they were witnesses of the process by which the middle or curial class had been destroyed, and that the great fortunes of the aristocracy had been collected under their eyes. The disorganisation of the economic structure and the centralization of wealth in the hands of an inconsiderable minority had been accomplished in a comparatively short period, and consequently the sources of the enormous fortunes of the time and the manner of their acquirement were matters of common knowledge. In addition the fathers did not set themselves up as the exponents of social theories or economic reforms. Their writings were not academic treatises, and their utterances were expressions of opinion to meet definite circumstances. They are never carried away by the idea that social Utopias can arise from economic adjustment. The cause of the trouble and misery lay too deep for cure by statute or sword. The fathers offered the remedy which they found in the Christian religion. They strove to arouse the individual conscience to a sense of duty and morality, to lay the foundations of social order in better and more upright individual lives, and to recall wealth and power to a full realization of their responsibility and limitations, by insisting that no man

<sup>25</sup> *Ad ecclesiam*, I, 2. Nos usum tantum earum rerum acceperimus, quas tenemus; commodatis enim a Deo facultatibus utimur et quasi precarii possessores sumus. Denique egredientes e mundo isto, velimus nolumus, hic cuncta relinquimus.

should seek self alone, but should serve others by being bound to the community through the exercise of fraternal love.

The primary principle of all patristic teaching of a social or economic character is the doctrine that all men have a common origin and a common destiny: "that whether rich or poor, bond or free, sound or sick, they are all one in the Lord, that they have one Head, Christ, from Whom are all things."<sup>26</sup> The nature of all men is the same, and all the affairs of mankind must be regulated according to that fact.<sup>27</sup> Human society itself was the work of Divine Providence,<sup>28</sup> and the bond of society fraternal love.<sup>29</sup> Through divine dispensation men in society are bound to mutual helpfulness and love; the strong should aid the weak, the rich the poor, the powerful those who were oppressed.<sup>30</sup> "Thus," says Ambrose, "in accordance with the will of God and the union of nature, we ought to be of mutual help one to the other, and to vie with each other in doing duties, to lay all our advantages as it were before all and to bring help one to the other from a feeling of devotion or of duty, so that the charm of human fellowship may ever grow sweeter amongst us and none be ever recalled from their duty by the fear of danger, but rather account all things, whether good or evil, as their own concern."<sup>31</sup>

Organised in this manner the relations of men with one another would be characterized by Justice and Humanity."<sup>32</sup> "For that which holds society together is divided into two parts, Justice and Beneficence, which also is called liberality and kindness. Justice seems the loftier, liberality the more pleasing of the two. The one gives judgment, the other shows goodness."<sup>33</sup> That such a system would not be expected to

<sup>26</sup> Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xiv, 8. (Migne, *P. G.*, xxxv, 868.)

<sup>27</sup> Greg. Nyss., *De Paup. Am.*, *Orat.* 2. (Migne, *P. G.*, xlvi, 489.)

<sup>28</sup> Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, v, 1.

<sup>29</sup> Greg. Naz., *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xiv, 8. (M. xxxv, 868), xiv, 6. (M. xxxv, 864).

<sup>31</sup> *De Officiis*, Bk. I, xxviii, 135.

<sup>32</sup> Augustine, *Ep.* 153. Migne, *P. L.* xxxiii, 653.

<sup>33</sup> Ambrose, *De Officiis*, Bk. I, xxviii, 130.



lead to absolute equality in all things is clear from the words of Chrysostom, who says: "because equality often leads to strife, God suffered it not to be a democracy, but a monarchy as in the army or the family in order that one might be subject and another rule."<sup>34</sup> Difference in station, did not however, destroy the essential equality which came from sharing the same nature.<sup>35</sup>

The principal question in connection with the teaching of the fathers on society and social topics is: did they advocate Communism or Collectivism in regard to property and wealth, and can their doctrines regarding the duties of men towards their fellows be made to include a belief in an equal division of all the fruits of the earth? On this subject, the starting point for their doctrines is, that men are not the owners but merely the stewards or administrators of their possessions. "We all," says Chrysostom, "have the use, but no man the ownership."<sup>36</sup> God gives the riches and man is merely the steward.<sup>37</sup> "From God have you received that which you give: what you offer Him is His."<sup>38</sup> "To Him, Who is our Father belongs all that we have."<sup>39</sup> "Give all to Him, Who gave you all."<sup>40</sup> Let us think nothing our own, seeing even faith itself is not our own but God's.<sup>41</sup> "Who but God gave you the rains, and the fields, and the arts and food and houses, and republics and friendship and happiness."<sup>42</sup> "For thou art steward of thine own possessions, not less than he who dispenses the alms of the Church. For even though thou hast received an inheritance from thy father, and hast in this way all thou possessest, even thus all are God's."<sup>43</sup>

<sup>34</sup> I. Cor. Hom. xxxiv, 6.

<sup>35</sup> Augustine, Ep. 155, 3. (M. xxxiii, 672). Socii sunt omnes homines: nam si pecuniae ratio socios facit, quanto magis ratio naturae non negotiandi sed nascendi lege communis.

<sup>36</sup> Hom. on Statues, II, 18.

<sup>37</sup> Greg. Naz. Orat., xvi, 18. (M. xxv, 960).

<sup>38</sup> Ambrose, De Nabuthe Jezraelita, xiii, 56. (M. xiv, 748).

<sup>39</sup> Greg. Nyss, De Paup. Am., Orat. I, (M. xlvi, 465).

<sup>40</sup> Greg. Naz., Orat. xiv, 22. (M. xxv, 885).

<sup>41</sup> Chrysostom, Hom. xxx, on Acts.

<sup>42</sup> Greg. Naz., Orat. xiv, 23. (M. xxxv, 888).

<sup>43</sup> Chrysostom, Hom. on Matt., lxxvii, 4.

By teaching that men were merely trustees the Fathers did not by any means wish to imply that all were trustees in the same sense, nor that all were entitled to an equal share either in possession or enjoyment. Property, like everything else in human affairs was viewed *sub specie aeternitatis* and was valuable or otherwise according to its bearing on man's ultimate destiny. Like everything in the world riches were created by God and were beautiful and pure, for the word of God made nothing useless or impure.<sup>44</sup> "Riches and gold and silver are not, as some think, the devil's, for the whole world of riches is for the faithful man."<sup>45</sup> In rejecting this Manichean doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of material things Cyril did not teach that Christians should make money or riches the object of their desires or efforts. "For I neither wish thee," he says, "to be a slave of money, nor to treat as enemies the things which God has given thee for use."<sup>46</sup> In themselves and from the standpoint of virtue and perfection, riches were not bad, but indifferent.<sup>47</sup> If Christians found anything in riches to object to, it was because they aroused in men the passions of covetousness and cupidity, and because they were a danger to the soul.<sup>48</sup>

But even though there were dangers to virtue and to salvation implied in the possession of riches, the Christian Fathers did not counsel that they should be abandoned by all. "I have no wish," says Augustine, "to spoil or strip them or leave them empty, I do not bid them to lose their goods."<sup>49</sup> In fact if the rich did abandon all they had one of the means of perfection would be removed. "If money," says Chrysostom, "was a universal possession and was offered in the same manner to all, the occasion for almsgiving and the opportunity for benevolence would be taken away."<sup>50</sup> The true Philosophy of

<sup>44</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. ad Amun.*

<sup>45</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. VIII, 6.*

<sup>46</sup> *Catech. VIII, 7.*

<sup>47</sup> Basil, In *Ps. I, 3.* (M. XXIX, 216). De *Inv. 5.* (M. XXXI, 384).

<sup>48</sup> Cyr. Alex. *Catech. XVI, 19.*

<sup>49</sup> *Sermon LXI, 11.*

<sup>50</sup> Chrysostom, *Hom. II, on Statutes*, no. 18. See Jerome. In *Matt. v. 42.* (M. XXVI, 41). *Divites si semper dederint, semper dare non poterunt.* Ambrose, *Expos. Evan. Luc. v, 53.* (M. xv, 1650). *Paupertas enim media est; possunt et mali et boni esse pauperes.*

Life, according to the Christian standard, was that which counted riches, not according to earthly possessions but according to faith and virtue. "A great thing is a faithful man," says Cyril of Jerusalem, "being richest of all men. For to the faithful man belongs the whole world of wealth, in that he disdains and tramples on it. For they who in appearance are rich, and have many possessions, are poor in soul; since the more they gather, the more they pine with longing, for what is still lacking. But the faithful man, most strange paradox, in poverty is rich; for knowing that we need only food and raiment, and being therewith content, he has trodden riches under foot."<sup>51</sup>

In making all things in life subordinate to spiritual advancement and eternal salvation, the Fathers adopted as a determining standard for the value of wealth and riches the uses to which they were applied. From this standpoint, while property had its dangers, it also had undoubted advantages.<sup>52</sup> "Do thou but use it well," says Cyril of Jerusalem, "and there is no fault to be found with money; but whenever thou hast made a bad use of that which is good, then being unwilling to blame thine own management, thou impiously throwest back the blame on the Creator. A man may even be justified by money. I was hungry and you gave me to eat: that certainly was from money. I was naked and you clothed me: that certainly was by money. And wouldst thou learn that money may become a door of the Kingdom of Heaven, sell, saith He, what thou hast and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven."<sup>53</sup> Chrysostom compares riches to beauty in woman, which had been called the greatest snare. The evil he says, is not in the beauty, but in unchaste gazing. "For we should not accuse the objects but ourselves, and our own perversity. . . . In the same way poverty brings innumerable good things into our life, for without poverty riches would be

<sup>51</sup> *Catech.* v, 2. See Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xiv, 28. (M. xxxv, 896).

<sup>52</sup> Ambrose, *Ex. Evan. Luc.* v, 69. (M. xv, 1654). In pecuniariis copiis multa sunt lenocinia delictorum, pleraque tamen sunt etiam incentiva virtutum.

<sup>53</sup> *Catech.* viii, 6.

unprofitable. Hence we should accuse neither the one nor the other of these: for poverty and riches are both alike weapons which will tend to virtue if we are willing." <sup>54</sup>

The Fathers saw nothing incongruous between the possession of riches and the sincere profession and practice of the Christian religion. "These things, I say," says Ambrose, "not because riches are a sin: the sin is in not distributing them to the poor and in the wrong use of them. For God made nothing evil, but all things good, so that riches too are good, that is if they do not master their owners." <sup>55</sup> "His wealth need not stand in the way of the rich man, if he makes a good use of it," says Jerome, "and poverty can be no recommendation to the poor if in the midst of squalor and want, he fails to keep clear of wrongdoing." <sup>56</sup> In spite of his asceticism, Jerome goes so far as to say that the wise man who is rich, is in a position to gain greater glory than the man who is merely wise; the latter can teach what is good, but sometimes he is unable to give what is asked of him. <sup>57</sup> The same thought constantly occurs in the writings of the Fathers, and without exception they maintain that the possession of wealth is in no way prejudicial to faith, provided such use is made of it as faith dictates. "Use what you have," says Gregory of Nyssa, "but do not abuse it." <sup>58</sup> In fact it was perfectly legitimate for the wealthy according to Augustine to enjoy the luxuries suitable to their condition. <sup>59</sup>

There is no note of inconsistency in the teaching of the

<sup>54</sup> *Hom. on Statutes*, xv, 10. See Jerome, *In. Is.* LVII, 10. (M. xxv, 554). Non solum divitiae, sed et paupertas probat hominem.

<sup>55</sup> *Hom.* XIII, I Cor. 8.

<sup>56</sup> *Ep.* LXXIX, v. (M. xxii, 726) Ambrose. In *Ps.* xxxvi, *Enan.* xxviii. (M. xiv, 981). Non divitiae accusantur, sed divitiae peccatorum.

<sup>57</sup> In *Eccles.* vi, 12. (M. xxiii, 1064). Majoris est gloriae sapiens cum divitiis, quam tantum sapiens. Alii enim sapientia indigent, alii opibus, et qui sapiens est et non dives, potest quidem docere quod bonum est, sed interdum non potest praestare quod petitur.

<sup>58</sup> *De Paup. Am.*, *Orat.* i. (M. xlvi, 465).

<sup>59</sup> Sermon LXI, 12. Ambrose, *Enarr.* xxxii, in *Ps.* xl. (M. xiv, 1082). Fidei non praejudicant opes: si tamen uti opibus noverimus. Cf. *De Officiis*, II, 26, 132. (M. xvi, 138). Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* III, 8.



Fathers regarding earthly possessions. Like all the gifts of God they had their uses. They were desirable not in themselves but because they might be made a source of justification. "If riches are a mere means of unrighteousness," says Basil, "woe to the rich man! If they minister to virtue, there is no room for envy, since the common advantages proceeding from them are open to all, unless anyone out of superfluity of wickedness, envies himself his own good things."<sup>60</sup> To the wicked riches are an impediment, to the good they are an aid;<sup>61</sup> those who know not how to use them are reprobate by the sentence of God Himself.<sup>62</sup> Provided men were humble and just, there was no difference in the eyes of God between the rich and poor.<sup>63</sup> "Let those of you," says Augustine, "who boast of your poverty, beware of pride, lest the humble rich surpass you: beware of impiety, lest the pious rich surpass you: beware of drunkenness lest the sober rich surpass you. Do not glory of your poverty, if they must not glory of their riches."<sup>64</sup>

While the Fathers thus defended the possession and legitimate enjoyment of riches, they were equally firm in their opposition to luxury and extravagance, to the selfish worship of mammon which saw in the possession of wealth only a means to selfish enjoyment.<sup>65</sup> To spend money foolishly on the collection of works of art, on clothing and fine houses, on silver services, and gold ornaments, in the purchase of slaves and lands, etc., was regarded as sinful and unchristian.<sup>66</sup> Equally reprehensible was the practice of acquiring wealth by means of oppression and injustice. Basil compares the rich of his time to the voracious fishes who devoured the smaller members of their own species. "We mortals," he says, "do not act otherwise when we oppress our inferiors; what difference is

<sup>60</sup> *Hom. XI, De Invid.*

<sup>61</sup> Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Luc.* VIII, 85. (M. xv, 1791). *Nam divitiæ ut impedimenta improbis, ita in bonis sunt adjumenta virtutis.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 69. (M. xv, 1654).

<sup>63</sup> Ambrose, *Enarr. v*, in *Ps. XLVIII.* (M. XIV, 1157).

<sup>64</sup> *Sermo. LXXXV*, 2. See Greg. Naz., *Orat.* XIV, 34. (M. xxxv, 904).

<sup>65</sup> Greg. Naz., *Orat.* IX, 18. (M. xxxv, 881).

<sup>66</sup> Athanasius, *Frag. in Matt.* (M. xxvii, 1371). Basil, *In Divit.*, VII.

there between the fish (who has consumed his fellows) and the man who, impelled by devouring greed, swallows the weak in the folds of his insatiable avarice. We incessantly move the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set, we encroach, we add house to house, field to field to enrich ourselves at the expense of our neighbor."<sup>67</sup> Property unjustly acquired was a badge of shame to its owner.<sup>68</sup>

Thus on all points concerning property and wealth the Fathers offered a coherent and fully consistent system, based not on economic considerations but on the requirements of the gospel. They made God the possessor, and because men, the trustees, were children of God, they were brethren and entitled through charity to a share in those things which were created for the common benefit of all. More clearly than their pagan neighbors they located the causes of the prevailing social and economic misery, and they did not hesitate to affirm, even in the face of universal ruin, that in the Christian religion was to be found the source of renewed strength and security. "Let those," says Augustine, "who say that the doctrine of Christ is incompatible with the state's well being, give us an army composed of soldiers, such as the doctrine of Christ requires them to be; let them give us such subjects, such husbands and wives, such parents and children, such masters and servants, such kings, such judges—in fine even such taxpayers and taxgatherers, as the Christian religion has taught that men should be, and then let them dare to say that it is adverse to the state's well-being; yea, rather, let them no longer hesitate to confess that this doctrine if it were obeyed, would be the salvation of the commonwealth."<sup>69</sup>

The assumption that the Fathers were advocates of Communism and opposed to the retention of property in the hands of individuals is based on certain texts taken principally from the writings of SS. Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome and Ambrose. The

<sup>67</sup> Hexaemeron, VII, 4.

<sup>68</sup> Ambrose, *Exp. Ev. Sec. Luc.* IV, 53. (M. xv, 1628). Greg. Naz., *Orat.* XIV, 34. (M. xxxv, 904.) Jerome, in *Jer.* xvii, II, (M. xxiv, 790). *Ep.* LXXII, 4.

<sup>69</sup> *Ep.* CXXXVIII, 15.

principal texts used to support this contention are the following. Basil in answer to the question, What wrong do I do, if I keep what is mine, says:

“Tell me then what is thine? Whence did you receive it? Did you bring it into the world with you? As one who takes a seat in a theatre, and would exclude all others claiming as his what belongs to all, so are the the rich, who seize what is common for all, and through prior-possession (*πρόληψιν*) make it their own. If everyone took only what was sufficient for his wants and left to those in need what was over and above, there would be no rich and no poor. Were you not naked from your mother’s womb? and will you not return naked to the earth? Whence therefore came your present possessions? If you say from Fate you are blasphemous, because you do not acknowledge the Creator nor give thanks to the Giver. But if you say, from God, give a reason why you have received them. Is God so unjust as to have distributed unequally the necessities of life. Why are you rich and another poor? Is it not that you may receive the reward of generosity and faithful stewardship, and that he may be rewarded for patience? You gather all things through your insatiable greed, and think you harm no one although you rob many. . . . Should not he be called a robber who could have clothed others and failed to do so? To the hungry belongs the bread you keep: to the naked the robe you have stored away: to the unshod the shoes which are rotting in your house: to the needy the silver you have buried. Therefore to as many as you could give, you do an injustice.<sup>70</sup>

From Chrysostom the principal passage is:

“Tell me, then, whence art thou rich? From whom didst thou receive it, and from whom he who trans-

<sup>70</sup> In *Luc.* xi, 18, 7. (M. xxxi, 276).

mitted it to thee? From his father and his grandfather. But canst thou, ascending through many generations, show the acquisition just? It cannot be. The root and origin of it must have been injustice. Why? Because God in the beginning made not one man rich and another poor. Nor did He afterwards take and show to one treasures of gold, and deny to the other the right of searching for it. But He left the earth free to all alike. Why then, if it is common, have you so many acres of land, while your neighbor has not a portion of it? It was transmitted to me by my father, and by whom to him? By his forefathers. But you must go back and find the original owner. Jacob had wealth, but it was earned as the hire of his labors.

"But I will not urge this argument too closely. Let your riches be justly gained, and without rapine. For you are not responsible for the covetous acts of your father; your wealth may be derived from rapine, but you were not the plunderer. Or granting that he did not obtain it by robbing, that his gold was cast up somewhere out of the earth. What then? Is wealth therefore good? By no means. At the same time it is not bad, if its possessor be not covetous; it is not bad, if it be distributed to the poor, otherwise it is bad, it is ensnaring. . . . why is it, that there is never a dispute about a market place? Is it not because it is common to all? But about a house, and about property, men are always disputing. Things necessary are set before us in common; but even in the least things we do not observe a community. Yet those greater things He hath opened freely to all, that we might thence be instructed to have these inferior things in common."<sup>71</sup>

Many passages are quoted from St. Ambrose in support of the

<sup>71</sup> *Hom. I, Tim. XII, 7.* (M. LXII, 563, 564). *Hom. on Acts, XI.* (M. LX, 96).



view that he favored a communistic form of society. The following are the more striking:

"Nature has poured forth all things for all men for common use. God has ordered all things to be produced, so that there should be food in common to all, and that the earth should be a common possession for all. Nature, therefore, has produced a common right for all, usurpation has made it a private right (*natura igitur jus commune generavit, usurpatio jus fecit privatum*).<sup>72</sup> The Lord God wished the earth to be the common possession of all, and its fruits to sustain all; but avarice has distributed the rights of possession (*possessionum jura*). It is just therefore if you claim anything as a private possession, that you give something to the poor, and thus not deny sustenance to those to whom you owe a share of your right (*juris tui consortium*).<sup>73</sup>

You do not give to the poor what is yours, but what is His, (*de suo reddit*). For you have claimed as your own, what was given for the common use of all. The earth belongs to all, not to the rich alone. Those who do not enjoy it are fewer than those who do. Consequently you are paying a debt not bestowing a gratuity.<sup>74</sup>

St. Jerome, despite his extreme asceticism, offers few passages that would give any ground for suspecting him of communism. Answering a certain Hedibia, who wrote to him from Gaul to ask how can perfection be attained and how a widow without many children ought to live. He said:

Since you have few children, make to yourself friends of the mammon of iniquity, that they may receive you into everlasting dwellings. Aptly did He say of iniquity: all riches come from iniquity, and unless one

<sup>72</sup> *De Officiis*, I, 28, 132. (M. XVI, 62).

<sup>73</sup> In *Ps.* 118, *Exp.* VIII, 22. (M. XV, 1303).

<sup>74</sup> *De Nabuthe*, XII, 53. (M. XIV, 747).

lost another could not find. Hence the common saying seems very true: the rich man is wicked or the son of a wicked man.<sup>75</sup>

There are no other passages in the works of St. Jerome which are worthy of quotation as containing anything like communistic sentiments. He seems to have had a special liking for the phrase he quoted to the widow Hedibia, for it occurs in two other places in his writings, in neither of which does he say from whom it was taken.<sup>76</sup> Its source is still unknown.<sup>77</sup>

These extracts represent practically all that the Socialistic writers, by careful gleaning of the works of the Fathers, have to offer in support of their views. How small the return is, can be seen from the fact that, in the edition of Migne, the works of Basil fill four quarto volumes (P. G. xxix-xxxii): those of Chrysostom eighteen volumes (xlvi-lxiv): those of Ambrose four volumes (xiv-xvii): those of Jerome nine (xxii-xxx). It need scarcely be said, that, if the Fathers entertained communistic views in regard to wealth and property, their writings would not be so barren of evidence of such opinions. For this reason and especially because of the fragmentary and misleading manner in which the Fathers are sometimes quoted, it seemed advisable to give the passages *in extenso*. A careful study of these extracts fails to reveal any proof that the Fathers favored Communism or Socialism. In the first place the question of private ownership is never raised. What the Fathers refer to is not the title but the use, not ownership, but enjoyment. In Basil the point at issue is merely in regard to superfluities: in Chrysostom that of just acquirement. He finds no fault with property, pro-

<sup>75</sup> *Ep.* 120, 1. (M. xxii, 983). *Dives aut iniquus aut iniqui haeres.* Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*, p. 69, quotes St. Jerome as saying opulence is always the result of theft, if not committed by the actual possessor, then by his predecessors. As no reference is given, it is fair to conclude, that Nitti considered his words a fair rendering of the saying quoted by St. Jerome.

<sup>76</sup> In *Habacuc.* III, 7. (M. xxv, 1316). In *Jer.* v, 26. (M. xxiv, 719).

<sup>77</sup> Funk, *Kirchengesch. Abhand. und Untersuch.* III, 151.

vided it be "justly gained." In fact he might even be accused of laxity, in reassuring those whose property was acquired by plunder, on the ground that they were not the plunderers. Ambrose, it is clear, did not refer to community of possession, but to community of enjoyment of the necessities of life, and Jerome's half-hearted endorsement of a current phrase may pass for rhetorical exaggeration.

In the second place, the statements quoted above refer not to riches and property, in general, but to the possessions of the rich to whom the Fathers addressed themselves. Officially, the bishops were the protectors of the poor, and circumstances were forcing them into the position of *Defensores Civitatum*,<sup>78</sup> and hence it is not surprising that they should, at times, have been vigorous in their denunciation of the rich whose aggressions had increased the miseries of the poor and pauperised the middle class.

Furthermore, they were fully justified in protesting against the absolute idea of property which then prevailed, and which admitted neither limitations nor responsibility in the owner. The *jus utendi et abutendi* of the pagans could not be maintained in face of the Christian doctrine of fraternal charity. Whether the Fathers viewed the responsibility of the rich towards the poor as one of charity or justice, need not be discussed. They were positive and uncompromising in their attitude that no man should retain what was superfluous, if others were in actual want. This was the only communism of which they were guilty, the communism which entitles all men to a share in the love of their fellows, and through that to a share in the things necessary for life, of which, some, as trustees of the Creator, were the proprietors. In addition the Fathers were devoted to the ascetical idea, and were not always careful to distinguish between what was of precept and what of counsel. Chrysostom himself confesses to this failing. "I know not," he says, "how I have been carried into such a transport in speaking such words as these unto men who think it a great

<sup>78</sup> Among the duties of the *Defensores* was: *plebem tantum vel Decuriones ab omni improborum insolentia et temeritate tueantur. Cod. Theod. I, 11, 2.*

thing to impart but ever so little of their own. Wherefore let these my words have been spoken to the perfect. But to the more imperfect, this is what we may say, Give of what you have unto the needy.”<sup>70</sup>

Enough has been said regarding the doctrines of the Fathers to show that deductions from their words regarding the duties of property are not valid arguments that they denied its rights. Basil, while he denounces the uncharitable rich can also find words of praise for the wealthy who share their goods with the poor.<sup>80</sup> Chrysostom assured his hearers in Antioch that wealth is not forbidden, if it be used for that which is necessary.<sup>81</sup> He disposes of the idea of a communistic state, saying: “that we may live securely, the sources of our existence have been made common. On the other hand, to the end that we may have an opportunity of gaining crowns and good report, property has not been made common: in order that by hating covetousness, and following after righteousness, and freely bestowing our goods upon the poor, we may by this method obtain a certain kind of relief for our sins.”<sup>82</sup> Ambrose asserts that crimes should not be attributed to property, but to those who do not know how to use it:<sup>83</sup> and Jerome expresses the belief that: “his wealth need not stand in the way of the rich man, if he makes a good use of it; and poverty can be no recommendation to the poor if in the midst of squalor and want he fails to keep clear of wrong doing.”<sup>84</sup>

From the actions as well as the words of the Fathers it is clear that they based their opinions regarding economic relations on the general principle of the innate dignity of human nature. Through this common possession all men were in a certain degree equal, and entitled, in those things necessary for the proper maintenance of life, to a just share of the fruits of

<sup>70</sup> *I Ep. ad Cor. Hom.* xv, 15.

<sup>80</sup> *De Inv.* (M. xxxi, 384).

<sup>81</sup> *Hom. on Statutes*, II, 14.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 20. See also *Hom. on Matt.* xxi, 1. *Ep. ad Corint. Hom.* XIII, 5.

<sup>83</sup> *Ep. Ev. Luc.* viii, 85.

<sup>84</sup> *Ep.* Lxxix, 1.



the earth. The main purpose of human existence was to attain salvation: to this all other considerations were secondary and subordinate. Because they were human, men were viewed as forming one family, united in the strongest bonds of fraternal love, and thus constrained to mutual aid and protection. Compared with the destiny appointed for them in Heaven the best the earth could offer was looked on as worthless. Injustice and rapacity were equally opposed to man's earthly privileges and supernatural end. Worldly possessions were valuable only in proportion as they aided in securing a heavenly reward. This reward came to those who looked on what they owned as a trust, and administered it in the way prescribed by the gospel, thus gaining the intercession of the needy and the approval of Him in Whose name they acted. This relative character of property did not destroy the true idea of ownership, nor did it transfer the title from the individual to the community. The best interests of religion were not to be attained in a communistic or collectivist form of society, but in a social condition which offered opportunities of mutual succor and care, through subordination of offices as well as possessions.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

## AN IRISH HOMILY ON THE PASSION: TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

---

This text, now published and translated for the first time, is found in two manuscripts, that of Rennes, and the Eger-ton 1781, in the British Museum. The ms. kept in the Library of Rennes, Brittany, contains 125 folios dating from three different periods. It begins with the Irish translation of the "*De Contemptu Mundi sive de Miseriis Humanae Conditionis*," composed, says Dottin, to whose article (*Rev. Celt.*, xv, pp. 80 ff.) we are indebted for the larger part of this account of the ms., "by Innocent III., and to be found in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* T. 217, col. 701-746." This identification, given without any proof, is doubtful, to say the least. The ms. contains, besides, homilies on various subjects, among them on the Blessed Virgin, the Passion of Our Lord, His Resurrection and Confession. There are also collections of texts from the Fathers, on Patience, Charity, the Pains of Hell, etc; a version in Irish (published by Whitley Stokes in *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, II, p. 1 and ff.) of the voyage of Sir John Maundeville, and a treatise entitled, *Teanga Bithnua*, the "Ever-New Tongue," (published by G. Dottin, *Revue Celtique*, xxiv, p. 365 ff.) The second section consists of a life of St. Colman soon to be published by Kuno Meyer. The third section contains the Dinn-Senchas, a collection of legends in prose and verse on the place-names of Ireland.

Several notes by different hands give us good reason to believe that the ms. was written in Ireland, and about the XIV century. It was in the possession of President de Robien in 1753. At that time it was referred to two learned Benedictines, (Dom Tassin and Dom Toutain), who were unable to make anything of it, but knew that it was written in Irish. They were better informed in this respect than a later compiler, the author of the Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Cambrai, who declared several Irish glosses in

a Latin homily by Alberic, Bishop of Arras, to be remnants of the old tongue of the Gauls. The question naturally arises, as to how this Irish ms. came to be found in the library of the President de Robien which brings up a very interesting and little studied chapter in Irish and Breton history. It was probably brought over by one of the many Irishmen who sought the protection of France during the troubled periods of struggle between the Irish and the English in Ireland. A writer in the *Annales de Bretagne*, vol. ix, pp. 524 ff., M. Paul Parfouru, in an article entitled "Les Irlandais en Bretagne, XVII et XVIII siècles," tells us that the emigration of the Irish into Brittany began in the XVI century. In 1678, an Irish College was founded at Nantes. Some doubt having arisen during the Seven Years War as to whether the Irish dwelling in Brittany were to be considered English citizens, a petition was circulated by the Irish residents of Nantes in which they maintained that they had always been treated in France as French citizens, and that the English were their hereditary enemies. This petition shows us the occupations of these Irish exiles: Sea captains, army officers, physicians, merchants and teachers. The Irish College had then 55 priests and students.

Cooper's Report contains a notice of our ms. Dr. Todd, in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. i, pt. 1, gave the first precise account of it, and Stokes mentions it in an article in *The Academy*. Probably basing his assertion on the title of the Homily, *Passio Christi secundum Bernardum*, Dottin attributed the authorship to St. Bernard, and identified the work with the "*Liber de Passione Christi et doloribus et planctibus matris ejus*," published in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* T. 182, cols. 1133-1142. A comparison of the two texts shows no relation whatever. A search made through all the passages of St. Bernard's writings indexed under the word, "*Passio*," failed to produce any text resembling in the least the one here ascribed to St. Bernard. Possibly some other Bernard may have been confused with the Saint. The author of a "*De Contemptu Mundi*," namely Bernard de Cluny, may have written our Homily. Considerable confusion exists on the identification of

the several Bernards who lived in the XII century. For example, some identify Bernard of Cluny, also called of Morlaix, with Bernard of Pisa who became Pope Eugene IV. It is just possible that this Homily is nothing more than a collection of texts brought together by someone and afterwards ascribed to St. Bernard. At any rate, we are not yet able to settle the question of its authorship.

While the literary value of our text may even be below the average of Irish works of this kind, and its language not always correct, it is here printed in the belief that all the unpublished material of this nature should be edited. No less a scholar than the late Professor Atkinson laid great stress on the utility of such publications as these. From a linguistic point of view, they are very valuable, for they offer the best introduction to the language and literature of Medieval Ireland, and their importance has only recently been recognized by linguists, theologians and church historians. It is much to be hoped that others may be encouraged to take a hand in exploring this little-worked field, and in putting this material at the disposition of scholars. Until all the compositions of this class are examined and studied no final judgment can be passed as to the intrinsic value of this mass of Irish ecclesiastical literature. It may be worth noting that in the popular Gaelic literature of Ireland poems on the Passion are not infrequent. One, containing numerous passages closely resembling some in our Homily, has been published by Mr. P. H. Pearse in the *Claidh-eamh Soluis*, Sept. 24, 1904 (not October, as given by Mr. Pearse, in a reprint and translation of the poem, in *The Irish Review*, March 1911). A somewhat similar poem entitled "The Keening of the Three Marys" will be found in Douglas Hyde's collection "*The Religious Songs of Connacht*," vol. I, p. 130.

The text is printed without change (except for the italics, which represent the filling up of abbreviations) from a photographic copy of the Rennes ms. in the possession of the Catholic University, and the footnotes give the more important variants from the Egerton ms. The translation has been made to keep as close as possible to the original.



## TEXT.

(fo 31d) *Pasio Christi secundum Bernardum .i. mar adeir Bernard*  
*næm ar-páis Christ .i. fech ana*<sup>1</sup>-agaid Ísa sa<sup>1</sup>-croich césta 7-doge-  
*bair*<sup>2</sup> a-tæb<sup>3</sup> ar-na-tollad<sup>4</sup> 7-a-drúim ar na-sciúirsad 7-a-cenn ar-na  
*tollad* (o fhiac lai bh na coiroine 7 a-lamha 7-a-chosa ar na-tollad)<sup>5</sup> o-na  
*clódaib* 7-indtóg<sup>6</sup> 7-athindtóg<sup>6</sup> an-cuirpD. næmta sin ó tæb co tæb  
*7-ó* baithis<sup>8</sup> co a-bonn 7-ní<sup>9</sup> faicfir<sup>9</sup> æn-ní<sup>9</sup> and acht-crechta 7-galar  
*7-adeir Bernard*: A-Ísa bennaigti<sup>10</sup> is-milis t-cænta<sup>11</sup> dona-dæinib  
*óir is-mór* 7-is-acfaindech do-tidhlaicis<sup>12</sup> tú fein dóib 7-is-trom 7-is-  
*gruama*<sup>13</sup> do-césadh trithu tú 7-is-truadh 7-is-ro<sup>14</sup>-truadh gruam-  
*dacht*<sup>14</sup> peine<sup>15</sup> na-croiche duit 7-adeir Bernard: A-duine féch<sup>16</sup>  
*a-t-menmain*<sup>16</sup> cá mét do-dlighfedhtea<sup>17</sup> do-tabairt don-tigerna do-  
*fulaing*<sup>19</sup> na-dochar-sin<sup>19</sup> do-t-cind<sup>20</sup> co-foighidech 7-cuimnidh ant-  
*allus fola docuir* se de ac-guidhi do-t-cind 7-dortad a-fola in<sup>22</sup>-a-  
*díaidh*<sup>22</sup>-sin 7-na-haithiside<sup>23</sup> examla (fo 32a) do-fhulain<sup>24</sup> o-n-  
*popul iúdaidh*<sup>25</sup> 7-an-coroin spine<sup>26</sup> ac-a-hullmugad cuigi 7-briatra  
*sgigemla* na n-iubul<sup>27</sup> ac-a-tabairt cuigi ac-gairm rí-de<sup>28</sup> 7 ac-cur  
*na-croiche* ar-a-hancairib .i. na-hinad comnaide docum<sup>29</sup> a-césta 7-  
*hé*<sup>30</sup> cengailti do pilér ac-eistecht briatra<sup>31</sup> na-n-iubul .i.<sup>32</sup> ac-a-rád<sup>32</sup>  
*ris crochaidh crochaidh* hé 7-olcus na-n-oilemna do-hullmuighthe dó  
*.i. aigeit* 7-domblas aói<sup>33</sup> 7-cach<sup>34</sup>-ní-ele doni'd digbal<sup>34</sup> don corp  
*áoenna* 7-an-tittal mór-clúach do-cúired<sup>35</sup> air .i. Ísa naserda<sup>36</sup> rí-  
*na-n-iubul* 7-crandcor ac-a-cur ar a-étach ac-lucht a-césta 7-mórán  
*examlacht*<sup>37</sup> oifici báis ac-an-ullmugad chuici 7-adeir<sup>38</sup> Adeir<sup>38</sup> Bernard  
*næm curab*<sup>39</sup>-decair<sup>39</sup> do-nech druis do-denam fan coroin spine oir  
*atat lamhanna fa-tlaimhaib-si*<sup>40</sup> 7-coroin spine fa-cenn ChristD.co<sup>41</sup>-  
*marthanach*<sup>41</sup>. Adeir<sup>42</sup> Bernard næm curab gruama do-foibred<sup>43</sup> do-  
*corp*, a-Christ don-tæb amuich 7-curab<sup>44</sup> truad<sup>44</sup> domter don-tæb  
*astigh* ac-a-comcesadh maille riut. 7 adeir Augustin a-lebar na hogh-  
*-achta* fechaid<sup>45</sup> crechta an césaidh 7-creitidh géiti cro na-heisergi

<sup>1</sup> in-aighi ar Isa crochda isin. Cf. below, fo 32.

<sup>2</sup> dogebha.

<sup>3</sup> a-tæbh, *Eg.*, in margin, *R.*

<sup>4</sup> fuiliugad.

<sup>5</sup> *Eg.*

<sup>6</sup> innto 7 aithinnto.

<sup>8</sup> baithius.

<sup>9</sup> faicter.

<sup>10</sup> ro-maith.

<sup>11</sup> h-cænta.

<sup>12</sup> tidhliucius.

<sup>13</sup> gruamdha.

<sup>14</sup> ri-truaighe 7 nis-ro-truaighe gruamdhacht.

<sup>15</sup> pian.

<sup>16</sup> do-suilibh t-inntinne.

## TRANSLATION.

The Passion of Christ according to Bernard. Thus says Bernard concerning the Passion of Christ: "Behold Jesus on the cross of suffering, and his side will be found to be pierced, and his back scourged, and his head perforated by the thorns of the crown and his hands and feet pierced by the nails, and the tossing and re-tossing of his sacred body from side to side." And from crown to sole nothing will be visible there but wounds and sores. And Bernard says: "O blessed Jesus, sweet is thy union to man, for freely and abundantly didst Thou bestow Thyself on him, and yet heavily and sadly didst Thou suffer at his hands, and wretched, wretched indeed for Thee was the horror of the suffering on the cross.

And Bernard says: "O man, consider in thy mind how much thou shouldst give to the Lord for having undergone those torments patiently for thy sake, and remember the bloody sweat which came from Him, praying for thee; and his blood that was shed afterwards, and the various insults which He bore at the hands of the Jewish people; and the crown of thorns which was prepared for Him, and the derisive words of the Jews which were hurled at Him hailing Him as King, and the setting up of the cross on its anchors, that is, in its resting place, for his crucifixion; and Him bound to a pillar, listening to the shouts of the Jews, crying out at Him, "Crucify, crucify Him"; and the pooriness of the food that was got ready for Him, even vinegar and gall, and everything else that does hurt to the human body; and the

<sup>17</sup> do-dlighfeá do-thobairt.<sup>20</sup> do-doinib.<sup>23</sup> haithisi.<sup>25</sup> iubulta.<sup>27</sup> na-n-iubul ris.<sup>29</sup> cum.<sup>31</sup> briatra ndiubulta na n-iubul.<sup>33</sup> æ.<sup>35</sup> docuredar.<sup>37</sup> d-examlacht.<sup>39</sup> nach alainn.<sup>41</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>43</sup> do-foidhre.<sup>45</sup> fech.<sup>19</sup> na-dochair-so.<sup>22</sup> ad-diaidh.<sup>24</sup> do-fulaing se.<sup>26</sup> sbine.<sup>28</sup> a-righ dhe.<sup>30</sup> é fen.<sup>32-33</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>34</sup> gach lictubair ele doni dibail.<sup>36</sup> nasardha.<sup>38</sup> sic MS.<sup>40</sup> fod-lamhaib-si.<sup>42</sup> oir adeir.<sup>44</sup> gur truagh.

7-fechaid an-fuil do-bí g-ar cennach 7-fechaid an-lúach dob-aíl do fagail do-chind na fola<sup>1</sup> 7-smuainidh<sup>2</sup> so a-meidhD.-tomais na derci 7-tabraid gradh<sup>3</sup> dona-neichib-so<sup>3</sup> indus corab a-figar<sup>4</sup> an-ar-craidedaib<sup>4</sup> mar dobí<sup>5</sup>-sin na-fdair isin croich tar-ar-ceand-si<sup>5</sup> 7 Adeir Job<sup>5a</sup> isin vii cabidil nar-pecaig ar-slanaigteoir<sup>6</sup> ac-techt dar-cennach 7-cur<sup>7</sup>-imcuir sé ana-umla fein serui ar-pecaig-ne 7-troma ar-caire<sup>8</sup> 7-é-fein can caire.<sup>8</sup> Adeir<sup>9</sup> Bernard mar-fechaim an-aged<sup>10</sup> Christ sa-croich do-cíter dam cur-caoi-sé 7-fiarfaigim dít a-I'sa ro-milis<sup>11</sup> cidh<sup>12</sup> imar-caódis<sup>12</sup> 7-cur-córa subachus<sup>13</sup> do-denam na-caoi o-do-oibrigis sláinti am-bolgan na-talman dona-cinedechaib<sup>14</sup> 7-cur-si'nis ar-pecaidh-ne ris-an crand<sup>15</sup> césta ac-damnad<sup>16</sup> an-diabail 7-ac-slanugad in domain 7<sup>17</sup>-aire-sin bud<sup>17</sup> lór do-slanugad in<sup>18</sup>-domain do páisi<sup>19</sup> 7 Adeir Béta ar<sup>20</sup> Lúcas suiscelach<sup>21</sup> an-faicenn tú béodacht mi'-trocairech an-popuil iubultaid<sup>22</sup> ac-tabairt<sup>22a</sup> imat<sup>23</sup> bás ndocraid don-tigerna nem-uurchóidech .i.<sup>24</sup> ac-a (fo 32b) crochad iter da-gattaide<sup>25</sup> 7-ac-cengal a<sup>26</sup>-lamh 7-a-chos<sup>26</sup> don crand césta 7-ac-tabairt<sup>27</sup> báis dó<sup>27</sup> co-hopann 7-do choimett seisin<sup>28</sup> a-spiratt<sup>29</sup> sa-croich tamall can bás do-fagail 7-ní-do-grad tsægail<sup>30</sup> do<sup>31</sup>-fein. D-sin<sup>32</sup> acht do métugud ar-slanti-ne and fein co-martanach.<sup>33</sup> 7 Adeir Jeoronimus cindus fétus nech siubacas do-denam 7<sup>34</sup>-cin dera do-dortad an-tan smuaines slegh an-doill<sup>35</sup> do-oslacud tæib ant-slanaigteora<sup>36</sup> 7 Adeir Augustin 7 Gregoir a-moralibus nar-gab día on-a-mac diles<sup>37</sup> do-bí can-cair can-a-cur tar-cenn ar-caire-ne ós-indaind dobí<sup>38</sup> an<sup>39</sup>-cair co-mór. 7<sup>39</sup> Adeir Bernard curab ard do-fulaing Christ a-crochad sa-croich docum<sup>40</sup> a-faicsina do-cach æn<sup>41</sup> 7-is-ard an-comarc do-rindi sé ac-iarrad fortachta ar<sup>42</sup>-an-athir<sup>42</sup> duinne 7-do-doirt dera imda<sup>43</sup> mar-eisimplair don duine do-denam aithrigi co-buan marthanach<sup>43</sup> 7-a<sup>44</sup> Adeir Bernard do-foillsig Christ a-tæb duit a-duine do<sup>45</sup> leigen a-ruin riut<sup>45</sup> 7-da-gradugad mar-do-gradaig se tú 7-do-foillsigud

<sup>1</sup> na-fola-sin.<sup>2</sup> smuaintigh.<sup>3</sup> do-so-co-luath gach uile gradh ata agaibh.<sup>4</sup> a-figur-so-in-bur-craidibh.<sup>5</sup> dobi si-sin in-a-figur isin croith tar-bur cenn-si.<sup>5a</sup> The reference to Job is a gross error, surely due to an omission on the part of the copyist who is perhaps quoting from a commentary on Job.<sup>6</sup> slanidh.<sup>7</sup> do.<sup>8</sup> do-gab se cugi gin gu-roibh cair ann fen.<sup>9</sup> 7 adeir.<sup>10</sup> ina aiged ar Crist.<sup>11</sup> ro-milis ar se.<sup>12</sup> cad far caidhius.<sup>13</sup> forbailtecus.<sup>14</sup> don.cinedhach.<sup>15</sup> croith.<sup>16</sup> damnugad.<sup>17</sup> gurub aire-sin a-tiagera budh.<sup>18</sup> ar-in.<sup>19</sup> do-chesadh sa a-t-ænar.<sup>20</sup> Beda.

much celebrated title that was given Him, to wit; "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews"; and the lots that his tormentors cast for his garments; and the many forms of the infliction of death which were prepared for Him." And Saint Bernard says that "it is difficult for one to be guilty of lust when under the crown of thorns, for there are gloves on thy hands and a crown of thorns on the head of Christ forever."

Saint Bernard says that fiercely was thy body assailed, O Christ, from without, and bitterly did it suffer from within, since both ways didst Thou suffer. And Augustine says in his book on Virginity; "Behold the wounds of the Crucifixion, and believe in the spears of blood of the Resurrection, and see the blood that redeemed us, and behold the reward which He was pleased to receive for that blood, and consider the measure wherewith He dispensed charity, and show love for these things, in order that this image may be in our hearts, as that love was manifested on the cross for our sakes."

And Job says in the seventh chapter, that our Saviour did not sin in coming to redeem us, but that He humbled Himself, and bore the bitterness of our sins and the weight of our offenses, although He Himself was blameless. Bernard says: "When I look at Christ on the cross, it seems to me that He weeps, and I ask Thee, O most sweet Jesus, why weepest Thou? It would be more fitting to rejoice than to weep, for Thou hast wrought healing unto the very bowels of the earth for the nations; and Thou didst spread out our sins on the tree of torment, confounding the devil, and

<sup>21</sup> suisgel.<sup>a</sup> tobairt.<sup>25</sup> *da* omitted in *Eg.*, *gadethibh.*<sup>27</sup> *basugad.*<sup>29</sup> *spiret.*<sup>31</sup> *Sic, Eg.* The ms. of Rennes originally had *dom* which a later hand has corrected to *do*.<sup>33</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>34</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>36</sup> *slainicidh.*<sup>38</sup> *dobi si.*<sup>40</sup> *cum.*<sup>42</sup> *fortacht* in *athar.*<sup>43</sup> *cum-a-cuimnich duinne 7-cum-aitrighe do-denum dorer arn isimlaradh.*<sup>44</sup> *Sic, MS.*<sup>22</sup> *iubulta.*<sup>24</sup> *examlacht* *bais.*<sup>26</sup> *a-chos 7-a-lam.*<sup>28</sup> *si-sin.*<sup>30</sup> *aimsir sægulta.*<sup>25</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>33</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>35</sup> *daill.*<sup>37</sup> *dilus nech.*<sup>39-39</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>41</sup> *æn duine.*<sup>45</sup> *arna-foslugudh do-tobairt fesa ruin duit.*



crechta a-chos<sup>1</sup> 7-a-lam<sup>2</sup> ar-in-adbarr cétna. Adeir Ambrocius cach<sup>3</sup> comrad ata ar-césad Christ curab-gruamda serb hé<sup>4</sup> docum<sup>5</sup> an-duine do-chæined a-pecad fein<sup>6</sup> 7-ní-dlegar<sup>7</sup> sólús corpdo do-beth a-timcill a-leghta 7-Adeir Augustin nach ail le-Día an-popul do-roind acht a-mbeth aici an-a-ænur ós-an-a-ænur<sup>7</sup> do-cendaig<sup>8</sup> iat 7-adeir fós curab díles do cumniugad páisi Christ dortad der<sup>9</sup> 7-craidhi<sup>10</sup> do-nertugad 7-gruaidi do-fliuchad 7-corp do-anmfandugad<sup>10</sup> Adeir Augustin<sup>11</sup> ó-césad<sup>11</sup> Christ do<sup>12</sup>-congmail a-t-craidhi<sup>13</sup> co-hindrech<sup>14</sup> cuimnech ní-fuil cair da-troma gabus<sup>14</sup> nert ort<sup>15</sup> 7-teithead cach uile peacad uait co-himlán<sup>15</sup> Adeir Bernard curab<sup>16</sup> imda césadh<sup>17</sup> tucad ar crist<sup>17</sup> arn-a-sanntugad on-díabal 7-arn-a-brath o-Iúdas 7-ac-fulang cach andlecht ele ar-lar nan Iubul. 7-ní-tabrad freagra orra 7-do-curtaidi césta air 7-do-beired sin solæit 7-do<sup>19</sup>-beired slainti do-dæinib<sup>19</sup> 7-do-hullmuigte easlainte dó-fein<sup>20</sup> 7-doni'd<sup>21</sup> seanmóir<sup>22</sup> 7-ní hestide<sup>22</sup> ris 7-do-senmorad an-umla 7-do-beirtaighi freagrata dimsacha air 7-doníthi ithimrad air 7-ni-denadh (fo 32c) ithimradh ar-nech 7-adertaighi ris com-bi'd<sup>23</sup> diablaidecht aici 7-do<sup>24</sup>-sgrisad an-diablaidecht<sup>24</sup> 7-do-bered tidlaicti<sup>25</sup> amach 7-do-fuilnged aithisi<sup>26</sup> 7-donid<sup>27</sup> arrdamainti<sup>28</sup> ar na-lochtaib 7-do-daingniged na-nem-lochta 7 Do<sup>29</sup>-glacadh hé fa-dered o-júbulaib<sup>29</sup> 7-do-claidhedar he mar-do-fetadar 7-do-cengladar hé 7-do-comgabadar do seiledhaib dó 7-do-sciúrsetar<sup>30</sup> hé<sup>31</sup> 7-do-chomdamnadar hé iter-da<sup>32</sup>-gataigi sa<sup>33</sup>-croich 7 do-fulaing<sup>33</sup> roime<sup>34</sup>-sin cach cumgach<sup>34</sup> da<sup>35</sup>-fuair<sup>35</sup> a-m-broind a-matar 7-in-a-hucht 7-a-mainsér an-asail a-n-étaighib crina ar-na-caithem roime<sup>36</sup> o-dæinib bochta 7-ar-tethedh leis san-egept<sup>37</sup> 7-ar-fagail gorta ann-sa-fásach da-chuidechtain 7-ac<sup>38</sup>-fagail a-sænta<sup>39</sup> sa-

<sup>1</sup> a-cosa.<sup>2</sup> a-lama.<sup>3</sup> gac æn.<sup>4</sup> iad.<sup>6</sup> da-eisimlarudh don duine a-pecadh fen do-chaineth.<sup>6</sup> ní do-dlegar.<sup>7</sup> osa-in-a-ænar.<sup>8</sup> do-cennaid se.<sup>9</sup> dera do dortadh.<sup>10</sup> gruaidhi do-fliuchad 7-corp d-ainfainniugad 7 craidhi do-nertugad.<sup>11</sup> Augustin acso in-slánti .i. cesadh.<sup>12</sup> re.<sup>13</sup> a-cridhi.<sup>14</sup> co-hinnrech 7-a-suile co-cuimnech .i. ní fuil druis na dimus na-saint na cair ele gabus.<sup>15</sup> isin crídhí a-cometecha cuimne cesta crist 7 co-teithinn gach uile cumachta peacaidh uadha 7.<sup>16</sup> curob.<sup>17</sup> examla ar-in tiagera nemhuurchoidech.<sup>19</sup> dallmhuigh daine cum-slainti.<sup>20</sup> fein, omitted in Eg.<sup>21</sup> doni.<sup>22</sup> senmoir 7 dobereth thecusc 7 ni-heisti.<sup>23</sup> bi.<sup>24</sup> eisen a-sgrisad na-ndiabal.<sup>25</sup> tidhluice.<sup>26</sup> aithis.

saving the world; and for this reason thy Passion would be sufficient to heal the world." And Bede says, commenting on the Evangelist Luke: "Dost thou see the pitiless rigor of the Jewish people, inflicting a multitude of horrible deaths on the innocent Lord, even crucifying Him between two thieves, and binding his hands and feet to the tree of torture, and putting Him to death straightway? And yet, He kept his spirit a while on the cross without dying; and not out of love of the world for Himself did He do this, but to increase our healing in it forever."

And Jerome says: "How can one rejoice, and not rather shed tears, when he thinks of the spear of the blind man opening the Saviour's side?" And Augustine says, and Gregory, too, in "*Moralibus*," that God did not accept satisfaction from His own Son, who was sinless, without first sending Him to suffer because of our sins, since great was our guilt. And Bernard says, that Christ suffered his Crucifixion high on the cross, in order to make Himself visible to every one, and loud was the cry He made, when calling on his Father for help for us; and He shed many tears as an example to man to do lasting, persevering penance. And Bernard says: "Christ laid open his side to thee, O man, to place his affection before thee, that He might be loved as He loves thee; for the same reason He showed the wounds of his feet and hands."

Ambrose says that every discourse concerning the Passion of Christ should be gloomy and sad, to the end that man may mourn his sins; and likewise, that bodily comfort should be absent when reading of it. And Augustine says: "It pleaseth not God to divide the people, but that they should be as one with Him, since it is as one He redeemed them." And he says further, that it is fitting when one is mindful of the Passion of Christ to shed tears, and to strengthen the heart, to wet the cheeks, and to weaken the flesh. Augustine says: "By keeping the suffering of Christ rightly in thy heart, remember, there is no sin, however grievous, that will gain strength over thee, but every sin will leave thee entirely."

<sup>27</sup> doni.<sup>28</sup> argaminte.<sup>29</sup> tareisi so uile do-glacadh o-iúbulaib é.<sup>30</sup> docom-sgiursadar.<sup>31</sup> Omitted in *Eg*.<sup>32</sup> da, omitted in *Eg*., gadaigib.<sup>33</sup> isin croich mar is-mo do féadar 7 do-fulaing.<sup>34</sup> gach cumgach roime so.<sup>35</sup> Omitted in *Eg*.<sup>36</sup> o-dainibh ele bochta roime.<sup>37</sup> ann-san eighipt.<sup>38</sup> ar.<sup>39</sup> a-sænta do-fen ann-sa-tempoll.

tempul<sup>1</sup> ona-docturib<sup>2</sup> ainmfesach ac-tagra ris 7-hé eólach<sup>3</sup> 7-ac-gabail poicci iúdás<sup>4</sup> asariacht 7-hé ac-a-brath 7-ac-eistecht Petur<sup>5</sup> ac-a-séna an-aimsir a-cesta 7-ac-fechain<sup>6</sup> na-coroine spine ac<sup>7</sup>-a-hullmugaud cuigi 7-ac-faicsin<sup>7</sup> an<sup>8</sup> matail purpure uime<sup>8</sup> sa pretuir .i. an-inad na-comurle<sup>9</sup> aingidi 7-ac-faicsin<sup>10</sup> clódha congmla a-ball<sup>10</sup> san-inad re-n-aburar<sup>11</sup> clauarie<sup>12</sup> locus 7-an-aidhchib<sup>13</sup> 7-a-láib<sup>13</sup> 7<sup>14</sup>-an-anæidendacht 7-an-amacándacht ar-fed a-æisi<sup>15</sup> ac-fulang dochar<sup>15</sup> 7<sup>16</sup>-cumgaid duinne ó-lá<sup>17</sup> a-genemna co-lá<sup>17</sup> a-césta 7<sup>18</sup>-andliged ar corp-ne aici-sin<sup>18</sup> ac-a-fulang an-a-corp-fein. Oir<sup>19</sup> dob-imda dochar<sup>20</sup> 7-tribloid<sup>20</sup> ac Christ ac<sup>21</sup>-a-fulang tar-ar-cenn-ne<sup>22</sup> co-bás na-croiche 7-adeir casidorus cret far sentaighetar na-hiubul bás do-tabairt<sup>23</sup> don nech do-athbeógaig na-mairb 7-do-olaic<sup>24</sup> na-geimlena<sup>25</sup> do-pecachaib an-domain co-himlan 7-adeir Adeir<sup>25a</sup> maighisder na-sdaire co<sup>26</sup>-tairrngidis cailgi na-coroine spine fuil chind ant-slánicid<sup>27</sup> ar fad a-cind<sup>28</sup> 7-a-droma 7<sup>29</sup>-a-da-tæb<sup>29</sup> anúas 7-co-tairrngidis ingne<sup>30</sup> cromad na-sgriursad<sup>30a</sup> croicend a-tæib 7-a-droma docum<sup>31</sup>-a-chind indus-cur comli'nad<sup>32</sup> le-chele a-corp<sup>33</sup> do-braenaib 7-do-brointib fola techtaidti on-a-baithis conuici-a-bondaib 7-adeir (fo 32d) Adeir<sup>34</sup> Bernard curab mór do-gruamdacht do-fulaing Christ sa-crand césta tar-ar-cenn-ne indus cur-cennaigh<sup>35</sup> sé gradh<sup>36</sup> do-fagail uainne co-himar-crach<sup>36</sup> Adeir Ambrosius nar-fétad an-cined dænna do-chennach acht monbud mó umhla a-cennaig ina dimus a millti ar<sup>37</sup>-tosach ríamh.<sup>37</sup> 7 Adeir Grigoir mona-fuilged Christ pían an-mesarda<sup>38</sup> ac-a-césad nach særfeti an-cined doenna ó-na-pianaib<sup>39</sup> do-tuilledar ac-denam

<sup>1</sup> a-sænta do-fen ann-sa-tempoll.<sup>2</sup> docturachta.<sup>4</sup> iudais asariacht.<sup>6</sup> faicsin.<sup>8</sup> 7-in-matail purpair cuge 7-a-gabail na-purpaire uime.<sup>9</sup> comairle.<sup>11</sup> R., abur.<sup>13</sup> an-aidhche 7-a-ló.<sup>15</sup> a-aisi 7-a-samreth 7-an-geimrad ac-fulang gac dochair.<sup>16</sup> 7-gac cumgaid.<sup>18</sup> 7-sæthar 7-docur 7-truaille ar ar-corp ndænna-ne aigi.<sup>19</sup> 7.<sup>21</sup> da-fulang.<sup>23</sup> tobairt.<sup>25</sup> an-geimlech.<sup>26</sup> com gur tairngidar.<sup>28</sup> taibh.<sup>30</sup> Omitted in Eg.<sup>31</sup> cum.<sup>3</sup> iulmar.<sup>5</sup> Peduir.<sup>7,7</sup> Omitted in Eg.<sup>10</sup> faicsin a-croithi 7 clódha a-ball do congmail.<sup>12</sup> clauaire locus cugi.<sup>14</sup> Omitted in Eg.<sup>17</sup> lo.<sup>20</sup> triboloide dochraide.<sup>22</sup> cenn-ne do-cinelaibh examla báis co-bas.<sup>24</sup> do-sgail.<sup>25a</sup> Sic, ms.<sup>27</sup> in-tiagerna.<sup>29</sup> Omitted in Eg.<sup>30a</sup> sgiursadh.<sup>32</sup> gur-linadar.

Bernard says that many were the sufferings inflicted on Christ in his temptation by the devil, and after his betrayal by Judas, and when enduring every other wrong amongst the Jews. And He gave no answer to them, but torments were inflicted upon Him; and while He brought solace and health to mankind, He procured ill-health for Himself; He preached, but He was not listened to; He taught humility, but received haughty answers; He was calumniated, but He did not calumniate anyone; He was told that He was possessed of devils, whereas He drove out the devils; He bestowed gifts, and bore reproaches; He defended the accused and fortified the innocent. Finally He was seized by the Jews, and they overpowered Him, since they were able to do so, and they tied Him and fastened Him with ropes and they scourged Him, and bound Him between two thieves on the cross.

Before that, He suffered every distress, in the womb of His Mother and on her breast; and in the manger of the ass, clad in old garments that had been worn out by poor men before Him; and her flight into Egypt with Him; and the hunger she endured to accompany Him in the desert; and receiving denials in the temple from the ignorant doctors who were arguing with Him who was full of wisdom; and accepting the kiss of Judas Iscariot, who was betraying him, and giving ear to Peter who was denying Him at the time of His suffering; and looking on the crown of thorns as they were getting it ready for Him; and beholding the mantle of purple that was about Him in the pretorium, that is, in the place of evil counsel; and in the place which is called *Calvariae locus*, looking upon the nails that were to fasten his limbs.

Night and day He experienced inhospitality and ill-treatment during the course of His life, enduring ills and tortures for our sakes from the day of His birth to the day of His Passion, and suffering the unrighteousness of our bodies. For, many were the trials and tribulations which Christ had to suffer for our sakes, even unto death on the cross. And Cassiodorus says: "Why did the Jews unite to inflict death on Him who brought the dead back to life, and loosed the fetters of the sinners of the whole world?"

<sup>22</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*

<sup>24</sup> *Sic*, MS.

<sup>25</sup> *cenneth.*

<sup>26</sup> *co-dlistinach mor gradhach gradh duthrachtach d-fagbail o-craidhi na daine 7.*

<sup>27-27</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*

<sup>28</sup> *mi-dlistinach.*

<sup>29</sup> *pianaibh dlistinacha.*



an<sup>1</sup>-pecaig<sup>2</sup> 7 Adeir fós an<sup>3</sup>-gein bett beó cuimneochat<sup>3</sup> mé<sup>t</sup> ant-sæthar fuair Christ tar<sup>4</sup>-mo-cend<sup>4</sup> ac-senmoir 7-an-popul geindtlidhi ac-tagra ris 7-ac-dortad<sup>5</sup> der co-foighidech ac-clai<sup>5</sup> cumacht<sup>6</sup> an-diabail 7-ac denam treigenais 7-uarnaighi<sup>7</sup> 7-farecrais 7-cuimneochat fós<sup>8</sup> an-selegar 7-an-galar<sup>8</sup> ger<sup>9</sup> fuair tar mo-cenn<sup>9</sup> 7-mí-toil tslanaighi na-crecht-so cuice sin<sup>10</sup> 7<sup>11</sup>-móran mí-troaire ele nach-eider do-airem.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>2</sup> *peceth.*<sup>3</sup> gibet beó do-cuimneochad.<sup>4</sup> *dom-chinn.*<sup>5</sup> ac-fulaing co-foigidech 7 a-dortad a-der aclair.<sup>6</sup> *cumachta.*<sup>7</sup> *fuiracrus 7 uarnaighi.*<sup>8</sup> fós air se seilidha 7-galur.<sup>9,9</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>10</sup> Omitted in *Eg.*<sup>11</sup> 7 maille so moran.<sup>12</sup> *turem.*

And the Master of Sentences says, that the pricks of the crown of thorns drew blood from the head of the Saviour down along his head and his back and his sides; and that the bent nails of the scourges tore the skin away from his side and his back, up to his head; so that his body was all covered with drops and drippings of blood which came oozing from head to foot. And Bernard says that great was the agony Christ endured on the tree of suffering for our sakes, in order that He might purchase our love and possess it in abundance. Ambrose says that the human race could not have been redeemed unless by a humility greater than the pride that first destroyed it. And Gregory says: "If Christ had not borne immoderate suffering during his Passion, the human race could not have been saved from the punishment it deserved for committing sin." And he says further: "So long as I live, I will be mindful of the greatness of the suffering which Christ bore for my sake, while teaching, and the gentiles arguing with Him; and shedding tears patiently when overcoming the power of the devil, and while fasting and praying and watching." And further, "I will remember the spittle, and the severe illness He assumed for my sake; and His unwillingness to be relieved of those tortures; and much other mercilessness that it is not possible to enumerate."

*(To be continued in the June number.)*

GEORGE W. HOEY.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**The Catholic Encyclopaedia.** New York, Robert Appleton Company, Vol. VIII.

All doubt as to whether the *Encyclopaedia* would realize the promises made when the work was begun have long since been laid to rest. In fact, the *Encyclopaedia* has already become a necessity to scholars and to men in public life; the wonder is how we managed to get along without a Catholic Encyclopaedia for so long a time. The Church, in English speaking countries especially, has been persistently maligned, her history has been falsified, her doctrines misrepresented and her practices and institutions caricatured. The wellsprings of English literature have been poisoned from the period of the Reformation and while apologists have explained and controversialists have triumphantly answered the calumnies hundreds of times, still even well-meaning men outside the Church knew not where to turn for the truth. Catholic priests and Catholic writers grew tired of explaining the same things over and over; and so multitudes of our young people grew up in our public schools and universities believing all manner of untruths about the Catholic Church. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, however, is rendering ignorance of this kind inexcusable for the future.

The volume before us is particularly rich in historical articles dealing with matters that have been persistently misrepresented. The article on Innocent III, from the able pen of Dr. Michael Ott, O.S.B., will be welcomed by all fair-minded historians of the period. The article on the Inquisition tells the whole truth, whether pleasant or unpleasant. The evident candor of the author as well as the documentary evidence submitted in connection with every point under discussion can scarcely fail to bring conviction to the seeker after truth. The article should prove effective in laying the many ghosts that have, during the past few centuries, haunted this subject. Speaking of the suppression of heresy during the first twelve centuries, the author concludes, after submitting his evidence: "Hence, the occasional executions of

heretics during this period must be ascribed partly to the arbitrary action of individual rulers, partly to the fanatic outbreaks of the over-zealous populace, and in no wise to ecclesiastical law or the ecclesiastical authorities." More strenuous means were used at a later date and Father Blotzer does not hesitate to set forth the actual transactions of the inquisition, nor does he seek to shelter the guilty from the blame which is due to them. Catholic students attending non-Catholic colleges and universities will find in such articles as the Inquisition and the Investiture the means of refuting the many offensive assertions which are frequently heard in class-rooms of Medieval history in these institutions. A multitude of readers throughout the English speaking world will naturally turn to the articles on Ireland, Irish Literature, and the Irish in countries other than Ireland. In like manner the article on Italy will be read with eager interest by Catholics throughout the world who have not had time to study its history in formal volumes.

Volume ix, *LaPrade-Mass*. The legal profession will naturally be interested in the article Law. The Church was largely instrumental in preserving Roman law and adjusting it to modern needs. But the interest in this article will not be confined to professional readers. There are so many questions of vital importance in which the concept of law plays a leading part that every thoughtful reader will be glad to have at hand in convenient form reliable information concerning the attitude taken by the Church. The scope of the article is shown by its several subdivisions: The Concept of Law, Obligation Imposed by Law. Classification of Laws, constitute the general theme, which is treated by Father Cathrein, S. J. Canon Law embraces the following subdivisions: General Notions and Divisions, Canon Law as a science, Sources of Canon Law, Historical Development of Texts and Collections, Codification, Ecclesiastical Law, The Principal Canonists. This division is from the pen of Dr. Boudinhon of the Institut Catholique, Paris. The influence of the Church on Civil Law, written by Dr. Shaefer, is arranged under the following heads: Slavery, Paternal Authority, Marriage, Wills and Testaments, Property Rights, Contracts, Prescriptions, Legal Procedure, Legislation, Government and Administration of Justice, Sacred Scripture in Legislation. Common Law is treated by the Honorable John W. Willis. The Moral Aspect of Divine



Law, is from the pen of Father Slater, S.J. International Law is dealt with by the Honorable Walter George Smith. Natural Law is treated by Dr. James J. Fox under the following headings: Its Essence, the Contents of the Natural Law, the Qualities of the Natural Law, Our Knowledge of the Natural Law. The final division of the subject, Roman Law, is from the pen of Dr. Joseph Kelly. Catechists will be particularly interested in the Liturgical articles from the pen of Dr. Adrian Fortescue, especially those on Liturgical Books and the Liturgy of the Mass.

Volume x, *Mass-Newman*. The article on the Sacrifice of the Mass by Dr. J. Pohle, presents the subject under the following sub-heads: The Dogmatic Doctrine of the Mass and Practical Questions Concerning the Mass. The clear exposition of the whole subject contained in these pages would go a long way towards removing the ignorant prejudices of many otherwise well-meaning and intelligent non-Catholics. But the article will be used especially by the teachers who would conscientiously prepare themselves for the instruction of our Catholic youth concerning this central act of Catholic worship. The article on the History of Medicine is full of interest not only for the members of the medical profession but for all those who are interested in the attitude of the Church towards the advancement of science and in the splendid work that her distinguished sons have accomplished in this field. The article on Metal Work in the Service of the Church will come as a surprise to many who are in the habit of regarding manual training as a modern innovation. Today, we seek to train the child to use his hands for purely selfish motives, but in the service of the Church, love of God and enthusiasm for the beauty of His house, lent skill to the hand of the toiler, while at the same time the social side of his nature was developed. The present stirring events in Mexico will cause many to turn for information to the able article of Father Grivelli, Professor of General History in the Instituto Cientifico, City of Mexico. The article on Miracle is very timely, since it has become the fashion in our day not only to deny miracles performed by the saints, but to reject even the miracles of the New Testament as antecedently improbable.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

---

**Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics**, edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D., etc. New York, Scribners, 1911. Vol. III. Burial—Confessions, Pp. xvi, 901.

The third volume of this learned and valuable publication maintains the standard of scholarship set by the first and second volumes. It contains articles on anthropological, philological, archaeological and ethnological topics connected with religion, written by the most eminent authorities and brought up to date as far as information and criticism are concerned. Among the articles by Catholic writers are "Charms and Amulets (Vedic)" by Dr. Bolling of the Catholic University of America; "Charms and Amulets (Muhammadian)," by Baion Carra de Vaux; "Coleridge," by Dr. Ryan of St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.; "Church, Doctrine of (Roman Catholic)," by Father Thurston, S. J. In the discussion of topics which may be said to belong to pure scholarship, and in the articles such as Father Thurston's, in which the Catholic point of view is set forth authoritatively, the Catholic student will find nothing that he can object to. In those questions, however, where scholarship and theological orthodoxy are intermingled, in questions of a "mixed" character, if the expression is permissible, there are many instances in which color is given to facts, and interpretations of facts are introduced in a manner which cannot but be displeasing to Catholic readers. The articles on philosophy, are, on the whole, above criticism. By way of exception, the writer of the article on "Conditional Immortality" disappoints us with the meager statement that "Among the Jews some Rabbis, notably Maimonides, held that the wicked would not live forever." Behind the phrase "some Rabbis" is an interesting episode in the history of Jewish religious thought in medieval times. Turning to the article on "Censorship" we find an interesting account of present-day law and practice on the part of civil authorities—Catholic censorship is to be discussed under the title "Index"—but surely there is a glaring inconsistency between the abrupt condemnation of censorship of books "it is impracticable, it is inadvisable" and the approval of censorship of plays. The reasons adduced for the control of dramatic productions should hold, *a pari*, in the case of books and periodicals. Finally, in the article on "Casuistry"

we find the usual reference to the contrast between the English and the Latin temperament. We should be disappointed if we did not.

WILLIAM TURNER.

---

**Certitude: A Study in Philosophy.** By Rev. Aloysius Rother, S. J.  
St. Louis, Herder, 1911. Pp. 94.

The preface to this little volume is a model of brevity. It says "The following pages present an exposition of *Certitude* according to the teaching of scholastics, and their purpose is to secure a greater esteem and love for the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas." This contains a promise and a hope. The promise, it seems to us, is fulfilled; the exposition of the scholastic doctrine is clear, accurate, and orderly. We are not so certain about the hope that the volume will secure a greater esteem and love for the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. There is in the author's treatment of this important topic a certain scholastic severity of method that will almost inevitably repel all except the convinced scholastic. What those outside the scholastic ranks need most is training in close, accurate thinking. But what they are most likely to take to is just the opposite kind of literature, the journalistic, the sprightly, the superficially brilliant lecture or popular exposition. One point in the scholastic exposition the author seems to have missed. He would, we think, succeed better in his description of "Moral Certitude in the wider sense" if he referred to the two-fold original meaning of the word "moral." "You are *morally* convinced," he says, perhaps from sad experience, "that in a book of fair proportions, some printing mistakes will be found." And he adds "This quasi-certitude is called 'moral' because actions performed with such mental assurance as it can give us, are justified before the tribunal of conscience." A flippant comment might be that the actions we are inclined to commit after "such mental assurance" has been fully confirmed by an abundant crop of typographical errors would be difficult to justify in conscience. The more serious consideration is that, according to the scholastics, (e. g. Lorenzelli, *Institutiones*, I, 109) the foundation, or motive, of this kind of certitude is "*modus consuetus*

*agendi hominum intellectu ac libertate utentium*," and has no reference to moral rectitude or "Justification before the tribunal of conscience."

WILLIAM TURNER.

---

**Tennyson: Fifty Poems, 1830-1864**, edited by J. H. Lobban, M. A. Cambridge: at the University Press. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1910. Pp. xxxiii, 299. Price 75 cents.

It is always disappointing, except perhaps in an anthology, to be presented with part of the work of any poet whose earthly career has come to an end. One likes to take him all in all, to trace the course of his genius from the first stammerings of his muse to his last firmly-rounded utterance; or, as may well happen, from the early maturity of heart-felt passion or pathos or patriotic fire to the feeble pipings which are the sure mark of senile decay. Nor is this desire for wholeness the effect of merely morbid curiosity: there are valuable literary lessons to be learned from the theory of development in a poet as he proceeds from youth to age. It will be therefore inferred that the selection given in the volume now under review is not regarded as entirely satisfactory. There are, however, in the law of copyright, apparently good and sufficient reasons for the limitations which the editor had to impose on himself; and, this granted, it may be at once said that he has put before us many of the poems which show Tennyson at his best. We have *Oenone* and *The Lotos-Eaters* and *Ulysses*, *A Dream of Fair Women* and *Locksley Hall*, the *Morte d'Arthur* and *The Lady of Shalott*, and with these, several of the pieces which exemplify Tennyson's mastery of melody, his depth of thought, and that prophetic vision which singles him out among the poets of the Victorian age. It is on the whole a notable collection. The *Introduction* is in excellent taste, and not only gives us an account of Tennyson's early life and literary activities, but also furnishes a fine example of what can be done in comparative criticism by a man who knows his subject in its various bearings. The Notes are brief, but illuminative. Some people may ask if Tennyson requires annotation. The answer is obvious: he does indeed. If, for example, a reader who does not possess a liberal education involving a knowledge of ancient



mythology and of biblical history as well as the history of Greece and Rome is set down before the bare text of *A Dream of Fair Women*, how hopelessly will he flounder for the poet's meaning, how utterly lost will he be in the maze of historical references. For such a one the editor of these selections from Tennyson has supplied the information that makes the poem intelligible, and therefore lightens the pleasure that is to be derived from its perusal. And it is so throughout. The volume is handsomely brought out; a special word of praise is due to the clearness of the type.

P. J. LENNOX.

---

**Voices from Erin and Other Poems**, by Denis McCarthy; New Edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1910. Pp. xi, 132. Price, \$1.00 net.

A double devotion, to the land of his birth and to the land of his adoption—that is the note that dominates throughout this book of Mr. McCarthy's poems. All the pent-up longing of the exile from Erin to tread once more the hills and the valleys, to wander by the streams, to hear the birds singing in the hedgerows and the groves of his sireland here finds sweet and melodious expression; nor is there lacking an enthusiastic display of that loyalty to the American flag which it seems to inspire in everyone who dwells beneath its folds. Facile and fluent in the stringing together of rhymes, Mr. McCarthy works delightfully the simpler emotions. He seeks to plumb no depths, to expound no recondite philosophy, to bring his reader through no psychological mazes. He understands his own limitations, and he therefore comes with a message of which there is no mistaking the meaning. His honest and manly heart beats true to faith and fatherland and the sacredness of the home. He is a close observer of nature, too: anyone who ever dwelt in Tipperary cannot fail to appreciate how well the various moods of the wind from Slievenamon are described in the stanzas devoted to the portrayal of its character as it is successively gentle, gracious, wailing, roaring, magic, and lonesome. The prayer that concludes a very beautiful piece is characteristic:

It blows across my mother's grave, wherein when life is gone  
God grant that I may rest beneath the wind from Slieve-na-mon!

An appealing note of pathos underlies such poems as "The Niobe of Nations," "The Hills o' Carrickbeg," and "In the Fields of Ballinderry," which suddenly changes to a martial swell in "The Song of the Bugle" and "The Irish on Parade." Some of the songs sing themselves. What the author says of "The Minor Poet" may appropriately be applied to himself.

He may not wake the mighty chords  
That rouse to fury and to fire,  
He may not voice in wondrous words  
The soul's supreme desire.

but what he does say is sweet and true and tender and straightway reaches the heart. An unpretentious book, this, but one deserving of high commendation.

P. J. LENNOX.

---

**An Anthology of the Poetry of the Age of Shakespeare**, chosen and arranged by W. T. Young, M. M. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: G. P. Putman's Sons. 1910. Pp. ix, 307. Price, 2s.6d., net.

A foreword to this volume tells us that the Cambridge Anthologies are intended for the general reader, not for the professed student of literature. In the preface we are informed that they aim at an adjustment of the claims of literature and literary history—to drive the reader back to the works themselves and to save him from second-hand judgments derived from the critic and the historian. The purpose is laudable and is very well carried out. The volume has eight divisions devoted respectively to lyric poems, descriptive and narrative poems, sonnets, classical poems, historical poems, reflective and moral poems, poetical addresses and satire. There is also a one-page glossary of obsolete or difficult words, with an index of authors and index of first lines. All the great names that fill the spacious times of Queen Elizabeth and her successor are here: Bacon and Shakespeare, Sidney and Spenser, Beaumont and Fletcher, Marlowe and Webster and Ben Jonson, and some fifty others, many of whom, in another

era, would be literary stars of the first magnitude. How copious the extracts are may be inferred from the fact that Shakespeare is represented by forty pieces, Ben Jonson by twenty-one, Sidney by twenty, John Fletcher by nineteen, Drayton by seventeen, and Spenser by sixteen. Southwell finds his place, but has only one piece, "The Burning Babe"—that wonderful allegory of which Ben Jonson said to Drummond of Hawthornden that "if he had written that piece, he would have been content to burn many of his own poems." Southwell is eminently quotable, and room might have been found, for example, for his "Dyer's Phancy turned to a Sinner's Complainte" or his "Thymes goe by Turnes." One loves to come across Drayton's spirited "Ballad of Agincourt," which is but too little known, but which in reality, as Sir Phillip Sidney said of *Chevy Chase*, stirs the heart like the sound of a trumpet. Lyly is well in evidence, as he deserves to be, for his lyrics have a perennial freshness and grace. A place is very properly given to Stevenson's rollicking drinking song, from *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, "I can not eat but little meat," which with its humor and its lilt and swing has served as a model for many a Bacchanalian ditty since. But if one were to note all the good things here provided, it would mean referring to practically every extract in the volume. The collection is a fine one, and seems likely enough to fulfill the wishes of the editors by making the reader wish for more, and so leading him on to a perusal, perhaps even a study, of the works themselves of which so good a sample is here brought forward.

P. J. LENNOX.

---

**World Corporation;** by King Camp Gillette; the New England News Company, Boston. Pp. 240.

From the invention and successful exploitation of a safety razor to the conception and organization of a world corporation, is a fairly long leap. In the present volume Mr. Gillette gives us the constitution and by-laws of his new organization (incorporated under the laws of Arizona, with offices in Boston) describes the automatic labor system of the future, and points out the wastes of the system in vogue today. World Corporation is empowered

to own all kinds of property, real, personal, and representative, and to carry on all kinds of industrial and commercial enterprises. Its organizer hopes that ultimately it will not only absorb and control all the economic activities of the world, but, "displace all governments,—tear down the barriers of caste and nationality, and combine in one brotherhood all the people of the earth for a common purpose" (pp. 42-43). Mr. Gillette admits that his expectations sound like the dream of a utopian Socialist, but maintains that his World Corporation will accomplish by tried and scientific methods what Socialism seeks to bring about by revolution. He would merely extend indefinitely the present movement of corporate concentration, until we should have, instead of a few great corporations controlling the leading industries of one nation, one corporation managing all the stable and staple industries of all the nations. And substantially all the individuals in the world would ultimately be shareholders. His expectations seem to be based mainly upon these assumptions: the larger the corporation, the greater is its stability, its economy, its lack of friction; and the smaller is its liability to injury through the dropping out of individuals, and its possibility of control by any clique. Mere size, with the accompanying stability and checks and balances, would prevent managerial autocracy. Many persons will, however, be inclined to question the theory that economy of operation increases indefinitely with the size of a concern, and the prediction that the corporation would be too large to come under the domination of a small number of the shareholders and directors. Size in this matter is relative; undoubtedly the controlling clique would have to be more numerous than in any corporation now in existence. Nevertheless, the project as worked out and presented by Mr. Gillette in these pages is by no means as extravagant as it is apt to seem at first thought, and its author is not a mere dreamer but a hard headed and successful man of business. The book is well worth reading.

JOHN A. RYAN.

---



**La vie internationale;** par le Vicomte Combes de Lestrade, correspondant de l'Institut; Victor Lecoffre; Paris; pp. 190.

In this little book we have a brief description of the most important facts and conventions which go to make up the international life of the world. While the author declares at the outset that the analogy between the individual and the nation may easily be overdrawn, he shows throughout the course of the work that the mutual relations and the interdependence of the nations are more numerous and more effective than most of us are apt to think. The book is divided into four chapters: Introduction; International Facts, International Laws, and the International Spirit. It is especially timely in view of the growing tendency toward the discouragement of narrow and militant nationalism, and the establishment of permanent international peace.

JOHN A. RYAN.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

On Tuesday evening, April 4, 1911, before the Special Child Study Club, in Washington, D. C., composed of teachers in the public schools, particularly those engaged in the work of ungraded schools and atypical classes, the Reverend Doctor Thomas E. Shields delivered an interesting lecture upon the present-day methods of instruction of children. He criticised the phonic or word method and contended that it had the tendency to fix words in the mind of the child at the expense of thought, drying up thought at the root. He reminded his hearers that the visual and the auditory faculties were the latest in development and were not the sole means of educating the individual, that there was splendid opportunity of reaching the soul through the deeper laid and earlier evolved sense of touch, for instance. He advocated a process of education that would develop real knowledge through the doing of things. He instanced the case of Helen Keller as typical of what may be accomplished in the absence of the senses of sight and hearing. The Doctor was of the opinion that free text books, medical inspection, and free dentistry were unconscious steps towards socialism, a serious invasion of the home, which is already the object of too many disintegrating forces under modern conditions. The Doctor had little sympathy with the study of eugenics, reminding his hearers that the magnificent brute specimens of the race evaporated without leaving an impress, that Divine Providence "fills the hungry with good things, while the rich he sends empty away."

Many of the teachers coincided with the views of the Doctor in regard to the abuses under the phonic or word method and one teacher has observed that ability to read rapidly in the third grade could exist without proper appreciation of the sense embodied in the printed page.

---

**Summer School.—The Catholic University of America.**

## SCOPE OF THE SCHOOL

The Summer School has been organized in order to give Catholic teachers an opportunity of profiting by the facilities which are provided in the University, and of obtaining under Catholic auspices whatever may be helpful to them in their work.

The courses here offered include both the professional subjects which are of vital importance to every teacher and the academic subjects which are usually found in the school.

Each subject is treated with a view both to content and to method, and the aim throughout is to base educational theory and practice on Catholic principles.

The schedule of courses as herein announced supersedes all previous announcements. Other courses will be organized if a sufficient number of requests are received in time to permit the necessary arrangements to be made.

Students should register, if possible, on Saturday, July 1. The Summer School will be formally opened with High Mass and sermon on Sunday, July 2, at 9 o'clock.

## DEGREES

The Trustees of the University have authorized a Normal Institute for teaching Sisters, which lay women also may attend, in the immediate vicinity of the University and under its direction. The Summer School is, in reality, the first step towards the realization of this project. Work done in the Summer School will count towards degrees on the same basis per hour as the work to be done in the future Normal Institute. All who desire academic credits will be required to take examinations at the end of the Summer School session.

## FEES

The fee for each full course is \$10. A fee of \$20 entitles the student to all the courses of the Summer School. An additional fee of \$5 will be charged for each laboratory course.

Room and board will be provided for the Sisters in the Uni-

versity buildings at a uniform rate of \$1 per day. Applications for such accommodation should be made as early as possible.

For further information concerning the Summer School, apply to

THE REGISTRAR.

#### FACULTY OF THE SUMMER SCHOOL

RT. REV. THOMAS SHAHAN, S. T. D., J. U. L., *Rector.*

VERY REV. EDWARD ALOYSIUS PACE, Ph. D., S. T. D., LL. D., *Professor of Philosophy.*

REV. THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS, Ph. D., LL. D., *Professor of Education.*

CHARLES HALLAN MCCARTHY, Ph. D., *Professor of American History.*

REV. WILLIAM TURNER, S. T. D., *Professor of Philosophy.*

AUBREY EDWARD LANDRY, Ph. D., *Associate Professor of Mathematics.*

ALFRED DOOLITTLE, A. B., *Instructor in Mathematics and Astronomy.*

REV. NICHOLAS ALOYSIUS WEBER, S. T. D., *Instructor in History.*

REV. THOMAS VERNER MOORE, C. S. P., Ph. D., *Instructor in Psychology.*

REV. ABEL GABERT, *Instructor in Music.*

LOUIS HENRY CROOK, B. S., *Instructor in Physics and Mechanics.*

XAVIER TEILLARD, B. L., *Instructor in French.*

FRANCIS J. FURGER, Ph. D., *Instructor in German and Spanish.*

REV. JAMES JOSEPH O'CONNOR, S. T. L., *Instructor in Latin.*

FRANCIS JOSEPH HEMELT, A. B., *Instructor in English.*

REV. PATRICK JOSEPH MCCORMICK, S. T. L., *Instructor in the History of Education.*

JOHN BERNARD PARKER, A. M., *Instructor in Biology.*

FREDERICK VERNON MURPHY, *Graduate of l'Ecole des Beaux Arts, Paris, Instructor in Architecture.*

REV. IGNATIUS WAGNER, C. PP. S., A. B., *Lecturer in Chemistry.*

JOSEPH SCHNEIDER, *Brevet Supérieur de l'Academie (de Paris), Assistant Librarian.*

FRANCIS A. SCHNEIDER, M. D., *Assistant Surgeon, Georgetown University Hospital.*

MARGARET TILDEN MAGUIRE, *Supervising Principal Wharton Grammar School, Philadelphia, Pa.*



## COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

*Education*

- I. PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION. Particular emphasis will be laid on those principles which differentiate Catholic from non-Catholic education. Thomas Edward Shields.
- II. HISTORY OF EDUCATION—I. Ancient and Medieval, with special reference to the conflict between Pagan and Christian Schools. William Turner.
- III. HISTORY OF EDUCATION—II. Renaissance and Reformation Period. Patrick J. McCormick.
- IV. PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION. Special attention will be paid to the development of the mental faculties of the child. Thomas Verner Moore.
- V. METHODS OF TEACHING RELIGION. Historical outline of the subject, Christ's manner of teaching; the principles applied by the Church; recent developments of method. Edward A. Pace.
- VI. PRIMARY METHODS. The work of the first three grades will be examined with a view to establishing general rules of method for the teaching of all subjects in the primary grades and the method of teaching religion in the primary grades will receive special attention. Thomas Edward Shields.
- VII. PHYSICAL DEFECTS OF CHILDREN. Methods of detecting common infectious diseases; examination of eyes, ear, and respiratory passages in their relation to mental retardation; clinic. Francis A. Schneider.
- VIII. METHODS OF TRAINING THE BACKWARD CHILD. The treatment of backward children from both a hygienic and an educational standpoint. New phases of child psychology. Margaret Tilden Maguire.
- IX. METHODS OF STUDY. Psychological aspects: Attention, Assimilation, Self-reliance, Expression. Five lectures. Thomas Edward Shields.
- X. METHODS OF TEACHING HISTORY. The methods of teaching history will be explained and exemplified in a series of lectures based on landmarks of American political history. Five lectures. Charles Hallan McCarthy.

## XI. METHODS OF TEACHING ALGEBRA AND GEOMETRY.

Various methods of presentation, selected theorems and problems for illustration, recent pedagogic tendencies. Five lectures. Aubrey Edward Landry.

## XII. METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH. The methods of teaching English proposed by the best educators; a plan to combine their most useful features. Francis Joseph Hemelt. Ten lectures.

*Philosophy*

## XIII. GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY. The methods of Psychology; current theories regarding the nature and development of mind; their influence on educational problems. Edward A. Pace.

XIV. LOGIC. The analysis of mental processes from the point of view of clearness, consistency and validity; examination of arguments; rules of reasoning; the estimation of evidence; logic of the sciences. Text-book. *Lessons in Logic*, Turner. William Turner.*Sciences*

## XV. ALGEBRA. Review of elementary algebra; selected topics from advanced algebra. Students will be consulted in the choice of topics. Aubrey Edward Landry.

## XVI. GEOMETRY. Drill in the solution of originals; solid geometry. Aubrey Edward Landry.

## XVII. ASTRONOMY. General and practical astronomy; work in the observatory. Alfred Doolittle.

## XVIII. PHYSICS. Mechanics, sound and light; twenty-five experiments. One hour lecture and two hours laboratory work daily. Louis Henry Crook.

## XIX. CHEMISTRY. General laws and doctrines of chemistry; connection between facts and principles; physical principles in chemical operations; laboratory work includes the preparation from ores and other crude materials of a number of chemical compounds. One hour lecture and two hours laboratory work daily. Ignatius Albert Wagner.

## XX. GENERAL BIOLOGY. The study of selected types ranging from unicellular forms to vertebrates and flowering

plants; collecting, rearing and preserving material for class use; life history, habitat, economic value, and systematic position of types studied. One hour lecture and two hours laboratory work daily. John Bernard Parker.

### *Languages*

literature from the arrival of the Saxons in Brittany to the present day (five lectures). A "masterpiece course" (twenty lectures). All lectures will be designed to meet the needs of the classroom. Francis Joseph Hemelt.

- XXII. ENGLISH—II. THEME WRITING. The principles of
- XXI. ENGLISH—I. LITERATURE. Continuity of English rhetoric and the forms of discourse; the fundamentals of English Composition; short themes weekly; one longer essay; private criticism and correction. Francis Joseph Hemelt.
- XXIII. LATIN—I. For beginners. The matter of this course will be arranged to meet the needs of the applicants.
- XXIV. LATIN—II. Cicero, Pro Milone and Pro Archia—Analysis and Interpretation. *Müller's Texts in the Teubner Edition*. Vergil—Biography. Interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue. Outline of Roman Literature. *Crutwell's Roman Literature*. Lectures and Exercises on Hale's Method of Reading Latin. Outline of the Syntax of the Latin Verb. *Bennet's Grammar*.
- XXV. FRENCH—I. French sounds; elements of grammar; drill in verbs; translation of French into English and English into French; reading of modern prose. Xavier Teillard.
- XXVI. FRENCH—II. Study of idioms; reading of classical and modern authors; writing of essays; conversation. Xavier Teillard.
- XXVII. GERMAN—I. Schweitzer's *Deutsches Lesebuch für ältere Anfänger*. Development of a practical understanding of the fundamental principles of the language; reading of easy narrative prose from current writers with conversational and written exercises. Francis J. Furger.

- XXVIII. GERMAN—II. Schweitzer's *Deutsche Kulturgeschichte Wort und Bild*; a history of civilization in Germany, with literary illustrations. Conversation in German on the subject of the text and written summaries. Francis J. Furger.
- XXIX. SPANISH. The essentials of grammar and pronunciation; reading of easy prose; exercises in translation. Francis J. Furger.
- XXX. CHURCH HISTORY. The historical point of view and the historical method; the position, action and influence of the Church during the Middle Ages, her relations to the civil power. Nicholas A. Weber.
- XXXI. AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. The Constitution of the United States; municipal, town, and county systems; the problems of the classroom and progressive methods of instruction. Text-book, *Civil Government in the United States*, McCarthy. Charles Hallan McCarthy.

### Art

- XXXII. SPECIAL INSTRUCTION IN FREE-HAND DRAWING. Drawing of simple geometrical solids, representation of form in line, light, and shade; the theory of composition; classroom exercises supplemented by outdoor sketching. Frederick Vernon Murphy.

### Music

- XXXIII. ART OF SINGING. Vocal training of school children; theory and practice of Gregorian chant; special instruction in harmony, counterpoint, musical composition. Abel L. Gabert.
- XXXIV. HISTORY OF PRINTING. Great printing centers and printers. Study of standard works of reference, such as the general and special encyclopedias, dictionaries, annuals and indexes to periodicals, ready reference manuals, etc. A study of the trade and national bibliography of the United States, England, France, etc. Principal schemes of classification. Codes of cataloguing rules. Various forms of catalogues and their objects. Charging systems, accession methods, book buying. Joseph Schneider.



## SCHEDULE OF COURSES

Class days are Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. All courses are given daily unless otherwise noted.

A. M.	Course
8	VI. Primary Methods.
	III. History of Education—II.
	XIV. Logic.
	XXIX. Spanish.
	I. Principles of Education.
	XXV. French—I.
	XXVII. German—I.
	XXXIV. Library Science.
	XIII. General Psychology.
	XXVI. French—II.
10	XXVIII. German—II.
	XVII. Astronomy.
	II. History of Education—I.
	XXXIII. Music.
11	XV. Algebra.
	XXI. English—I. Literature.
	XXIII. Latin—I.
	V. Methods of Teaching Religion.
12	XVI. Geometry.
	XXII. English—II. Theme Writing.
	XXIV. Latin—II.
P. M.	IV. Psychology of Education.
	XXX. Church History.
3	XX. General Biology.
	XIX. Chemistry.
	XVIII. Physics.

- XXI. American History.
- XX. General Biology, Laboratory.
- 4 XIX. Chemistry, Laboratory.
- XVIII. Physics, Laboratory.
- XXXII. Drawing.
- VIII. Backward Child.
  
- VII. Physical Defects of Children.
- XXXII. Drawing.
- 5 IX. Methods of Study—Monday.
- X. Methods of Teaching History—Tuesday.
- XI. Methods of Teaching Algebra and Geometry—  
Thursday.
- XII. Methods of Teaching English — Wednesday and  
Friday.
- XX. Biology, Laboratory.
- XIX. Chemistry, Laboratory.
- XVIII. Physics, Laboratory.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Recent Bequests.** The Catholic University has been generously remembered by three well known Catholics of Brooklyn, N. Y. Upon the settlement of the estate of Mr. Martin Kavanaugh, of which the University was the residuary legatee, the sum of \$10,082.59 was received. Mrs. Francis A. O'Mahony, widow of John O'Mahony, bequeathed the sum of \$5,000 for the founding of another Brooklyn scholarship, and Mrs. Ellen Haggerty left in her will the sum of \$1,000.

**Gift to the Library.** Among the most precious of the volumes kept in the department of biblical science in the Library is a recent gift of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, entitled *The Golden Latin Gospels*. It is an edition with facsimiles and critical notes of a manuscript now in Mr. Morgan's Library and formerly known as King Henry the VIIIth's Gospels.

**Monsignor Russell.** Reverend William T. Russell, D. D., Rector of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, and President of the Alumni Association, has recently been advised by the Holy See of his elevation to the rank of Domestic Prelate. The BULLETIN joins Monsignor Russell's host of friends in offering him its most heartfelt congratulations on this well merited distinction.

**Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall.** The report of the Committee in charge of the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Fund is most satisfactory. The contributions already received warrant the authorities of the University in proceeding without delay to the erection of the Hall. The style chosen is a magnificent example of Tudor-Gothic of gray stone, with a large central tower. The building is designed to accommodate two hundred students.

**The Summer School.** The number of prospective students of the Catholic University Summer school, as represented by the



percentage already registered, is likely to exceed all expectations. The latest report from the Registrar's office is that more than a hundred Sisters have already placed their names on the register. A circular containing a list of subjects and a schedule of the courses, with a complete *horarium*, has been prepared and is now being mailed to those who are interested in the work of the school.

**Lecture at Trinity College.** Miss Agnes Repplier's lecture on "The Mission of Humor," at O'Connor Hall, Trinity College, was highly appreciated by the students and professors of the University who had the pleasure of hearing it. The author of "Compromises" and "Convent Days," counts among her friends many of the subscribers of the BULLETIN, all of whom rejoice at the distinction conferred on her by the presentation of the *Laetare* medal for 1911.

**The Symposium.** The April number of *The University Symposium* contains, in addition to poems, essays and sketches that are very readable, a number of personal items both from within the University and from among the Alumni that will be read with a great deal of interest. The section headed "Athletics" tells the tale of recent successful achievements, and will be welcomed by former students, clerical as well as lay.

**The St. John Chrysostom Society.** The St. John Chrysostom Society has been recently established at the University. The officers of the society are: Honorary president, His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons; acting president, Rt. Rev. Monsignor Shahan, S. T. D.; vice-president, Very Rev. Henry Hyvernatt, S. T. D.; treasurer, Rev. A. A. Vaschalde, C. S. B., Ph. D.; secretary, Rev. Sigourney W. Fay. On Monday, March 27th, a regular meeting of the society was held, in which proposed programs and policies were discussed, and several committees appointed. The work of the society is first, to publish a list of available liturgical books containing the original texts; secondly, to present in pamphlet form an accurate translation of the liturgical documents of the first six centuries, together with

copious commentaries and notes ; and, finally, to edit the liturgical texts now in use in the various churches. The committees appointed are the following :

Committee to Ascertain What Liturgical Texts are Available for Publication : Rev. A. A. Vaschlade, C. S. B., Ph. D. ; Rev. Thomas K. Reilly, O. P. ; Mr. Andrew Shipman.

Committee on Liturgical Texts of the First Six Centuries : Rev. Sigourney Fay, Rev. John Delanay, C. S. C., Ph. D.

Committee on Publication : Very Rev. Henry Hyvernatt, S. T. D. ; Rev. Sigourney Fay, Mr. Andrew Shipman.

Since it is the object of the society to satisfy a need long experienced by liturgical students, it is hoped that the endeavors of the society will meet with cordial co-operation and support.

---